

O R

*Annual Priest-hood, and all
the Sacrifice of Christ.*

WITN

*The Mystery of the Mass. Containing an exact
Examination, and sacred Confutation of the
Romish Sacrifice.*

BY

*John Watts M^r of Artes, of Sydney-
College in Cambridge, and one of
the Ministers Preachers Authorized for
the County of Lancaster.*

1 JOHN 4. 1.

*Beloved, believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits
whether they are of God: For many false Prophets are gone out into
the World.*

1 THESSAL. 5. 21.

Prophesy, &c. Hold fast that which is good.

LONDON,

*Printed by Thomas Orde, at the Sign of
the Crown, in St. Dunstons Church-yard, near
St. Dunstons Church, in the County of Middlesex.*



The Bodleian Library, Oxford, has acquired this volume from the library of the late Sir Thomas Bodley, Bart.

The following is a list of the books in the collection of the Bodleian Library, Oxford.


LONDON.

Printed by Nicholas Oakes, at the sign of the Anchor, in Fleet Street, near St. Dunstons Church, in the year 1754.



TO THE RIGHT
NOBLE, AND TRVELY
Religious, JAMES Lord STRANGE,
Heire to the Right Honorable WILLIAM
Earle of Darby: I. L. wisbeth encrease
of blessings Internall, Externall,
Eternall.

RIGHT HONORABLE:

S the God of Nature hath Decked
that Great Man the World with
diuers ornaments, it being in no-
thing more admirable then in va-
riety; so hath the same God in-
riched that little World Man, with sundry en-
dowments, he being in nothing more profitable
to the Church, then in Diuersity: For to some
he hath giuen to be Apostles, to others to
be Prophets, to others to be Teachers; and
all this for the gathering together of the
Saints, for the workes of the Ministry, for
the building vp of the body of Christ. So

Ephes. 4. 11, 12.

The Epistle Dedicatory.

that wherein one is Detectiue, another is Excellent, that the Church of Christ may bee perfectly instructed in all things, by the mutuall labours of each fellow member.

Hence it comes to passe that some men abound with variety of Tongues; others with interpretation of Languages, some with the smoothnes of Doctrines, and others are acquainted with the knotty study of Polemicall Theologie: there being nothing commodious for that Mysticall body of Christ, which cannot be supplied by one member or other. And albeit this renowned Kingdome of great Britaine flows with multitudes of most pregnant wits, (as once did Canaan with Milke and Hony) who are farre more powerfully able to buckle with our Aduersaries, then my selfe; yet (beeing confident in the Almighty) I haue with little Dauid aduentured to encounter with this great Philistim of Gath, the Romish Masse, hoping my labours (albeit vnpolished with Eligancy of stile) shall not bee altogether vnprofitable to the Church. The intolency of the Romish Foxes, (as in all places of this Land, so more especially) in those parts, where your Honor hath Command and Mansion, and my selfe Residence

The Epistle Dedicatory.

confidence and Employment, hath forced me to the search of this subject: The settling of weake, and confirmation of sound Protestants, hath pressed it to the Presse. The bonds of Respect and Duty, wherein I am obliged unto your Honor, bind both my selfe, and it unto your Noble Selfe; unto whose Patronage I Com-mend it, and under whose Name I commit it to the wide World.

The Motiues that induce me to Dedicate this small Treatise to your Honor, are in short most

First the Externall Nobility of your Birth, being so Noble a Branch, equally springing from two Illustrious Stems. Secondly, the Internall Nobility of your Grace, manifested by your so sincere affection to Religion, wherein with Timothy, your Honour hath beene instructed from your Child-hood, and to the true Professours whereof, your Lordship hath vouchsafed alwayes a gracious countenance. Thirdly, your purpose to visite other Kingdomes abroad; where doubtlesse occasion will be offered unto your Lordship, to maintaine that Truth wherein you haue beene bred, and to oppose that Falshood which you cannot but detest. Wherefore I presumed to preferre this part of my

The Epistle Dedicatory.

studies, vnto your Honorable Patronage, that it might remaine with your Honor as an Antidote against the Poyson of Popery, and Infection of the Romish Locusts. Lastly, that hereby I might render vnto your Honor some testimonie of thankfulnessse, for those manie vnderferued Fauours, which Your Lordship hath beene pleased to conferre vpon mee; that as I remaine bound vnto Your Honor for euer: So heereby I might free my selfe from the staine of Ingratitude.

Accept therefore, (I most humbly beseech your Honor) this pledge of his vnfained thankfulnessse, who shall continually pray to God to blesse your Lordshippe with aboundance of Honor, Wealth, Grace, Prosperity in this World, and the full Fruition of Eternall Glory in the World to come,

Your Honours in all

seruice to be Commanded.

IOHN LEVVIS.



To the Christian Reader.

Christian Reader, the audacious and frequent practise of the Masse-Priests, in offering their blasphemous Sacrifice; with the unsufferable impudency of the Romish Laity, both in conference to iustifie, and by presence to communicate therein; (more especially in our Northerne parts, where I am Resident) hath constrained me to wade into this abstruse Mystery, not intending to make it the Worlds common object; (as may appeare by the stile,) but rather to furnish my selfe with Defensiuē and Offensiuē armour; matter of answer and opposition in case of encounter. What intention had vowed mine owne, in treaty of Friends, and desire of the Common good, hath made thine. If thou know the Author, censure not his youth (seeing the scantinesse of yeares, is supplied by the largnesse of Industry) but if thou finde any fruite worth gathering, taste it thankfully, rendering God the glory, methy Prayers. The solidity of the matter I hope, thou canst not impeach; the plainnesse vsed in Penning, with the Faults escaped in Printing, I hope thou wilt winke at, Iudge me.

Thine in any Christian service.

JOHN LEVVIS.

In Blasphemiam Sacrificorum.

P*riests make Christ, Body, and Soule, you must not doubt,
They eat, drinke, box him vp, and beare about:
One's too little; Bread and wine
Hold him senerall; so we dine,
Thou with thy Christ, I with mine.*

*Is thy mouth the Virgins wombe? Is bread her Seede?
Are thy words the Holy Ghost? Is this our Creede?
Oh presumptuous undertaker!
Nener Cake could make a Baker,
Yet the Priest can make his Maker.*

*What's become of all those Christs the Priests haue made?
Do those hoasts of Hosts abide? or doe they fade?
One Christ abides, but all those flie;
One Christ liues, but all those die;
One is true, the rest a lie.*



T. B.



MELCHIZEDECHS

Antitype.

Or

*The eternall Priesthood and All-
sufficient sacrifice of Christ.*

Hebr. 10. 12.

*But he having offered one Sacrifice for sinne, sitteth
for ever at the right hand of God.*



He Authour of this Epistle writing vnto the beleeuing Iewes which had receiued the doctrine of Christ, intends not to perswade them that *Iesus* was the *Messiah* foretold by the Prophets to bee the Sauour of the world, for of this they were already satisfied: but his scope and intent is rather more fully to informe them concerning the offices of *Christ*, which

*Caluine in the
argument of
this Epistle.*

B

he

Chap. I. v. 1, 2.

Verſ. 2. 3.

Verſ. 3.

Verſ. 4.

The difference between
Christ and
Aaron.

he propoſes largely and exactly to be three: Prophe-
tically, Kingly, and Prieſtly. Theſe hee layes downe
generally in the three firſt verſes of this Epistle. For
firſt hee ſhewes that whereas the Lord had ſpoken
obſcurely and vmbatically by his Prophets touch-
ing the *Chriſt*, yet now hee ſpoke perſonally by his
Sonne, who was the *Meſſiah* himſelfe and the great
Prophet of his Church. Secondly, he ſhewes that
Ieſus was our Lord and King appointed by his fa-
ther as *heire of all things, by whom he made the world*;
in whom alone the glorie and maieſty of the father
is to be contemplated, *who ſuſtaineth all things by his
mightie word*, each creature obeying his command.
Thirdly, that the ſame *Ieſus* the ſonne of God was
the Prieſt which offered that all ſufficient ſacrifice
for remiſſion of the finnes of all that beleue in
him.

Thus the Authour hauing layd the ground worke
of his ſubſequent matter, doth in the ſequell of the
Epistle poliſh euery particular part with ſundry ar-
guments, ſtill building vpon that foundation which
he had laid. But becauſe the Iewes thought it ſtrange
that the Goſpell ſhould take place, and be preferred
before the *Law*, therefore the Authour firſt declares
the excellency of *Ieſus Chriſt* ſhewing him to be not
only man but God, farre aboue all Angels, and
conſequentially worthy of a great deal more honour
then *Moses*.

Having handled his Prophecticall and Regall offi-
ces, hee comes in the fourteenth verſe of the fourth
chapter to his Prieſtly office; and comparing him
with *Aaron*, layes downe diuers differences be-
tweene

twene *Christ* and *Aaron*; who differed:

First in person, the one being onely man, the other as well *God* as man.

Secondly in qualitie, the one being sinfull, offered sacrifice, not onely for others but for himselfe also; the other being *Choribamartius*, without sinne offered himselfe for vs.

Thirdly in order; the one being of the *Leuiticall* order; the other after the order of *Melchisedech*; and consequently the one was temporarie; the other eternall.

Fourthly in the manner of sacrificing; *Aaron* offered the blood of beasts, but *Christ* offered himselfe, yea his owne blood.

Fifthly in efficacie; the sacrifices of *Aaron* being in themselves of no vertue, not able to cleanse sinne: but the sacrifice of *Christ* was effectuell purging all beleeuers from all their finnes.

Sixthly in the reiteration; for *Aaron* and his sons were bound to reiterate their sacrifices euery day: *Christ* offered once for all.

Seauenthly, *Aaron* entred into an earthly tabernacle without the people, but *Christ* into a heavenly with all his faithfull members.

Then the Apostle shewes what *Analogie* and proportion there was betweene the Priest-hood of *Christ*, and that of *Aaron*; which agreed,

First in election, for as the *Leuiticall* Priests were elected to their office: so was *Christ* ordained of his Father.

Secondly, they did offer sacrifice with blood, so did *Christ*.

Thirdly,

The agreement between
Christ and
Aaron.

Thirdly, they did it in behalfe of the people, so did *Christ*.

Fourthly, they prayed for the people, so did *Christ*.

Lastly, they entred into the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, *Holy of Holies*; so did *Christ*.

The Authour in the ninth chapter hauing compared the carnall rites with the spiritual; the earthly Tabernacle which was corruptible; with the glorious tabernacle of *Christ's* humane nature which was and is incorruptible; the blood of beasts with the blood of *Christ*; shewing that these were but the shadowes, whereof *Christ* was the substance, in whom we inioy all things spiritually, and by whose blood all things are sanctified vnto vs: in this chapter he shewes the insufficiencie of the Leuiticall oblations to be imployed by their frequent reiteration, and the perfection of *Christ's* sacrifice by the single act: wherefore the *Hebrewes* should not rest in the Leuiticall sacrifices, which being types of *Christ* had their perfection in him, who hauing offered one sacrifice for sinne, sitteth for euer at the right hand of God.

The text diu-
ded

This text doth diuide it selfe into two parts.

{ An Agent

and

{ His Actions.

The Agent in this relative pronoun, *Autos*, *He*.

His Actions are two. The first done and past. The second present and in doing. The first, *hee offered one sacrifice for sinne*; where we haue.

First the subiect of his action, *He offered a sacrifice*.

Secondly,

Secondly, the singularity of this subject. *One sacrifice.*

Thirdly, the end of both; *for sinne.*

His second action is expressed by three predicaments.

Situs. His gesture *He sitteth.*

Ubi. His place; *at the right hand of God.*

Quando. His time; *how long for ever.*

In the first is intimated his Maiestie; in that *he sitteth.*

In the second his Omnipotencie; *at the right hand of God.*

In the third his Eternitie; in that *he sitteth for ever.*

In the first action you haue Christ in the state of humiliation. In the second in the state of exaltation. In the first he is dying for sinne; in the second triumphing over sinne. And first of the first, *Hee hauing offered one sacrifice for sinne.*

In the handling of which words this Method shall be obserued.

First shall shew *who was the Priest* that offered.

Secondly, *what was the sacrifice* which was offered.

Thirdly, *the scope and end* whereunto it was directed.

This Priest was Christ, the eternall sonne of God, one with the Father, Creatour of all things, and by whom all things doe subsist, King of Kings, Lord of Lords, a perfect man without sinne, full of grace and truth. He it was that tooke vpon him this function to be a Priest, and to offer an all-sufficient sacrifice to expiate for the sinnes of the elect. And herein did Christ *separately* differ from the Leviticall Priests.

Christ both
Priest and
Sacrifice.

in that they were onely the persons offering sacrifice, and not the sacrifice it selfe; but *Christ* was both the Priest and Sacrifice: for there could no sufficient sacrifice bee found for the sinne of man; but onely *Christ*; and none worthy to offer the sonne of God, but onely himselfe.

But seeing *Christ* in the vnitie of his person had entertained a dualitie of natures, consisting of *Deitie* and *Humanitie*, hence arises a question.

Quest.
Answ.

Whether the Priestly office of *Christ* belong vnto his *Godhead* or to his *manhood*, or to both? The answer is, that *Christ* is this Priest according to neither nature separately or diuided, but according to both natures ioynntly, as he was both God and man. See this confirmed, *How much more shall the blood of Christ who by the eternall spirit, offered himselfe to God, purge our consciences from dead works to serue the living God.* By which eternall spirit we are to vnderstand his eternall *Godhead*, concurring with his *manhood* to make him a perfect Priest.

Heb. 9.14.

Why *Christ* as
Priest was to
be God and
man.

The reasons why the Priestly office of *Christ* did require that he should be both God and man are these. First as he was a Priest, so was he to be a Mediatour; but he could not be a Mediatour except he were God and man; for *Opera Christi Mediatoris sunt Theandrica: The workes of Christ which concerne his Mediatourship proceede from both natures.*

Pelag. Syn.

Heb. 7.3.

Secondly, because he was to be a Priest after the order of *Melchizedech*, so that he must bee *apator* and *ameter*, without father, without mother, as *Melchizedech* was. Now he was not without father but as he was man, nor without mother but as he was God.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, because hee must be both God and man that reconciled in one God vnto man, and man vnto God.

Lastly, because no creature could satisfie Gods iustice but onely God, none ought but onely man; wherefore the Godhead of Christ did giue vnto his manhood efficacy and merit to deserue at Gods hands remission of our sinnes: for the manhood of it selfe without the Godhead hath no vertue or efficacy to be meritorious. So it appeares that Christ Iesus was the High Priest for his elect, according to both natures.

Concerning the Priesthood of Christ there are three things observable.

First, that albeit Christ was a Priest, yet he did not arise out of the Priestly stocke of *Aaron*, he was not of the tribe of *Leui*, but of the Princely stocke of *David*, being borne of the tribe of *Judah*, and that for these two reasons.

First, to shew that hee was not a Priest after the order of *Aaron*, but of a new order differing from the Leviticall as the *Anti-type* from the *Type*, the true Priesthood from the figurative.

Secondly, he arose of the Regall tribe of *Judah*, that so like *Melchisedech* hee might bee not onely a Priest but a King. Yet notwithstanding in the priesthood of *Aaron* there were many resemblances of Christs Priesthood. 1. In that the high Priest was annointed with oyle, so was Christ spiritually: God even thy God hath annointed thee with the oyle of gladnesse above thy fellows. 2. In the sumptuous apparel which the high Priest put on: a type of the rich and

Why Christ did not arise out of the Priestly stocke of *Aaron*.

Psal 45 7-

and glorious robe of Christs righteousness. 3. In the speciall parts of the high Priests attire; as the Ephod, the shoulders whereof had two Onix stones whereon were engrauen the names of the twelue tribes; to represent Christs carrying all the elect on his shoulders; supporting them in this life against the world, the flesh, and the diuell. Next the breast-plate of iudgement wherein were set twelue stones ha-ving engrauen on them the names of the 12. tribes of Israel; and with these did he appeare before God in the Sanctuarie; representing thereby that Iesus our High Priest being in his heauenly Sanctuarie, beares in memorie all the elect before God; and vpon this ground the Church in the Canticles prayes that she might bee set as *a seale vpon his heart, and as a seate vpon his arme.* Then the *Vrim* and *Thummim*; the first whereof signifies Lights; the second Perfections; representing in Christ. 1. The light of wisdom, for in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. 2. His perfection, wherein he excelleth all creatures. Lastly, the Priest had a plate on his forehead whereon was engrauen *Holinesse to rebowah*; representing the holines of Christ wherewith he doth appeare before his father for the redemption of his people.

Cant. 8.6.

Col. 3. v. 1

wherein are hid
all the treasures of
wisdom and
knowledge

Christs priest-
hood how
eternall.
Psal. 110. 4.

In the second place we are to obserue the eternity of Christs Priesthood; for it is saide, *Thou art Priest for euer after the order of Melchisedech.* Now the Priesthood of Christ is said to bee eternall; not that Christ shall for euer offer sacrifice for the sinnes of his people; but that the vertue and efficacie of his sacrifice doth extend it selfe vnto eternity in the saluation

saluation of all beleeuers: in that by the merit of this oblation of his death and passion hee hath purchased for all his members eternall glorie. So that the eternitie of Christs Priesthood consists not in the continuation of his Sacerdotall acts, but in the eternall effect of his sacrifice vpon the elect. For when Christ shall at the last day iudge the world, and shall inuest the soules and bodies of all his Saints with glory and immortalitie, then shall cease the Prophetically, and Priestly offices of Christ, and onely his Regall or Kingly office shall remaine: for the Saints in glorie shall haue perfect knowledge, and shall need no information from him as a Prophet; nor shall neede the sacrifice or intercession of Christ as a Priest, but shall yeeld all obedience in thought, word, and deede vnto him as their King.

Quest. But how can the sacrifice of Christ beeing (but finite and temporarie) be of infinite and eternall merit?

Ans. The act of Christ vpon the crosse, offering himselfe a sacrifice for the finnes of his Saints was a finite act, and temporarie, lasting but some certaine houres, and so consequently could not be of it selfe of infinite and eternall vertue: but if we consider that with his manhood there was inseparably vnited his Godhead which was of eternall and infinite efficacie, and Christs sacrifice was accepted of his father, not onely as the sacrifice of *the sonne of man*, but also as the sacrifice of the *Sonne of God his onely begotten Son*, then we must needes confesse the sacrifice of Christ to be of infinite and eternall merit. Here then is the solution of this doubt. Albeit the Manhood of Christ

Math. 3. 17.

onely was the sacrifice for our finnes which did satisfie Gods wrath, yet the Manhood of Christ alone was not sufficient: for the Dietie must concur (though not in suffering) yet in giuing vertue, power, and efficacie to merite eternall life at the hands of God.

Thirdly, wee are to obserue the parts of Christs Priesthood which are two.

1. Cor. 6. 20. &

7. 13.

1. Col. 20. 27.

2. Cor. 5. 18, 19.

First, Satisfaction or Expiation for our finnes, whereby Christ hath payd the price for our iniquities, and hath giuen himselfe an all-sufficient rancome for vs. From which satisfaction ariseth our reconciliation whereby God is well pleased with vs in his Sonne, and wee in Christ are made the *Sonnes of God*.

Rom. 8. 34.

Secondly, *Intercession*, and that consists of two things.

Heb. 9. 24.

First, in that he makes request for vs before his father, not that he doth kneele before him to pray for vs, but that hee doth continually and incessantly appeare before him by the merit of his righteousness making intercession for vs: for as Christ did vnite his eternall righteousness vnto his humane nature at his birth, and continued it vntill his death; so his humane nature endued with perfect righteousness appeares before God the Father in heauen after an ineffable manner making request for vs.

Heu. 8. 3. 4.

Psalm. Synt.

Ephel. 5. 2.

Secondly, in that hee doth offer our prayers and thanksgiuings to God, making them acceptable in himselfe, Christ is that Angell spoken of by S. John, *The golden altar is his Godhead, signifying Purity and Merit, his incense is his righteousness, which beeing*

an offering of a sweet smelling savour in the nostrills of his Father; makes the prayers of the Saints acceptable to the father.

These things being thus made plaine touching the Priesthood of Christ; the Thesis or point of Doctrine followes, *That there neuer was, nor euer shall be any Priest that could or shall hereafter offer a perfect satisfactorie sacrifice for the finnes of the redeemed, but onely Christ Iesus the son of God.* For if any creatures could haue satisfied for the sin of man, and reconciled him vnto God, he would neuer haue layd so heauy a burthen vpon his onely Son, as to endure the shame of cursed Iewes, and (which was tenne thousand times more) the infinite wrath of his heavenly Father for the transgressions of mankind. And indeede Christ onely was sufficient for this office if we consider these particulars.

Doctrine.

First, he that was to offer such a sacrifice must bee God and man, after the order of *Melchizedech*, without father, without mother; which should be King of *Salem*, and authour of eternall peace; who was so but onely Christ?

Reas. 1.

Secondly, hee that offered such a sacrifice was of no lesse worth, merit, and dignity with God then the sacrifice it selfe; seeing (as *Irenaeus* speakes) *The sacrifice receiues its efficacy and value from the Priest that offers it.*

Reas. 2.

Wherefore the sacrifice that was offered for the finnes of man, beeing of infinite worth and excellencie, according as the sinne of man was of infinite deformitie, and deserued infinite punishment; so must the Priest likewise bee of infinite desert at the hands

of God that must offer so great a sacrifice. Hereupon it followes that the humane nature of Christ being perfectly holy of it selfe, yet not infinitely holy, could neuer haue beene a sufficient sacrifice for our sinnes, had not the Dictie beene vnited to it, so to make him an infinite Priest, that hee might giue infinite merite and efficacie to his oblation. But a creature of infinite desert could not be found. Not Angels who are finite in being, and whose holinesse is but deriued from God, his Sanctitie being the fountaine and theirs the streames. Not man for he had corrupted his wayes, and was become abhominable, and had neede of a Mediatour to stand betweene God and himselfe. None therefor was sufficient for this function, none worthy of this Priesthood but *Christ Iesus the Sonne of God.*

Differences
betweene a sa-
crifice and a
Sacrament.
Zanch. in 5. cap.
ad Ephes.

Gen 4.

Heb. 10. 2.

Isa. 1. 11.

By the ground of this reason, wee may obserue a maine difference betweene a Sacrifice and a Sacrament: a Sacrament doth not receiue it efficacie and vertue from the minister, but may be administred effectually to a beleuer, albeit it be by a wicked Minister; but a sacrifice is either accepted or reiected for the worthinesse or vnworthinesse of the person offering. As appeares euidently in *Cain* and *Abel*, their sacrifices both sufficient for matter, but God imbraced *Abels*, because he offered with a righteous heart, and abominated *Cains*, because he was wicked. The people of *Israel* and *Judah* because their *hand was full of blood*, and their hearts full of impietie, therefore were their sacrifices an abomination vnto the Lord, and for their wickednes did the Lord detest his owne ordinances.

The third reason why Christ onely is that Priest who can offer a perfect propitiatorie sacrifice for the sinnes of mankind, is because he that offered that oblation was to haue neither *archem emeron*, nor *zoes telos*, beginning of dayes, nor end of life; but what creature is there which was not framed in time by the God of eternity; seeing in the beginning God made the heauen and the earth, and all things therein, where then shall we find any Priest to parallell eternity, but onely Christ Iesus the Sonne of God.

Heb. 7. 3.

Gen. 1. 1.

Fourthly, there was and is but one Mediatour betweene God and man, which was the office of the Priest, but this Mediatour is onely Christ Iesus. For albeit there bee appointed ministers of Gods holy word to present the prayers of the faithfull before God, and to impetrate for them, yet this is not for the worthinesse of their owne persons and in their owne names, but in the name and for the worthinesse of Christ do they make request for the whole Church of Christ. And to this purpose Saint Augustine writeth in these words, *If the Apostle had sayd, These things haue I written vnto you, that you should not sin; but if any man sinne you haue me for a Mediatour, and I by my prayer obtaine pardon for your sinnes (as Parmenian placeth the Bishop to be a Mediatour betweene God and the people) what good or faithfull Christian could abide him, who would behold him as the Apostle of Christ, and not rather as Antichrist?* By which words of Saint Augustine, it appeares to be a point of Antichristianisme to place any creature as a Mediatour betweene God and man, but onely hee who was both God and man Christ Iesus.

1. Tim. 2. 5.

Contra Parmenian, lib. 2. ca. 8.

Hob. 7. 24.

Fiftly and lastly there is but one that could offer this Sacrifice, because as the Priesthood was peculiar to Christ alone, so the act of offering this sacrifice according to the order of that Priesthood did properly and personally appertain to Christ. Now Christ had such a Priesthood as no creature was capable of, and therefore the Apostle calls it *aparataton ierosumen*, such a priesthood as could not passe from him to any other creature, no not to the father or the holy Ghost; therefore was it translated from *Aarons* order to Christ, where it resteth, and from whom it cannot be translated or remooued by succession, or any other wayes; and seeing he hath translated the Leuiticall Priesthood, and bound it to his owne person, hee hath thereby made the new Testament vnalterable, and his priesthood vnchangeable. Wherefore seeing there is but one onely that is God and man, *after the order of Melchisedech, without father, without mother, king of Salem and Prince of Peace*. Seeing there is but one that is of equall dignitie, with this all-sufficient sacrifice. Seeing there is but one that *hath neyther beginning nor end of dayes*. Seeing there is but one *Mediatour betweene God and man*. And seeing the priesthood was tyed to one particular person, and all these agree onely vnto Christ; it followes therefore that there is but one onely priest who was worthie and able to offer this perfect satisfactorie sacrifice; and that was Iesus Christ.

Vse 1.

The first vse of this point is for confutation of the doctrine of the Church of Rome; for you haue heard that Christ is Priest not according to his humane nature onely but also according to his diuine, which

which the papists vterly deny; making him to bee a priest onely as he was man; but altogether vniustly; for in the office of priesthood there are two things necessarie. Ministerie and Authoritie. In respect of the Ministeriall part Christ performed that office as man; but in respect of Authoritie of entring into the *Holy of Holyes*, and presenting vs before God and reconciling vs vnto him, which was the principall part of his priesthood, he did performe it as the Sonne of God; as the second person in the Trinitie, co-worker with the Father in the creation of the world: wherefore that he might be a priest able and worthy to make attonement with God he was God; that his reconciliation might extend to men, he was man; and so being God and man he is a perfect mediator between God and man; and an *high Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek*.

Falke on the
5. Heb ver. 6.

But the Papists hold Christ to bee a Priest onely in his humane nature, because they thinke that onely in his humane nature he was annoynted.

Object.

I answer, that if this annoynting be onely taken for the collation of the gifts and graces of the Spirit; it is true, onely the humane nature of Christ was annoynted. But by this annointing is also vnderstood the ordaining of Christ to be the Mediatour and Saviour of the world, and in this sence not onely his humane nature but also his diuine was annoynted to this end. For the humane nature of Christ albeit it was pure and spotlesse, yet could it neuer haue wrought our redemption without the assistance of his Godhead, for as he was man, so he was borne, hee fasted, he suffered, he dyed; but to rise from the graue,

Answ.

ad no. 11. 1.
A. 12. 1. H. 1.

to ascend into heaven, to reconcile vs to God, this he could not doe but by the power, might, and efficacie of his Godhead. And to this purpose are the words of Bernard, *Singula illius opera ad hanc siue illam necesse est pertinere naturam: ad hanc scilicet miseriam, ad illam pertinet potestas.* All the workes of Christ doe appertaine either to one nature or other; to the humane nature belongs his miserie; to his diuine nature, his power.

Diuers authorities of the Fathers are alleadged by the Rhemists for the proouing of their opinion, which you shall find sufficiently answered by learned *Fulke* vpon the fift chapter of the Hebrewes, vers. 6.

Vse 2.

Secondly, seeing Christ onely is that Priest that can offer an al-sufficient sacrifice for the sinnes of his elect, this then demonstrateth the sacrilegious blasphemie of the Romish Priesthood, that they dare presume to arrogate that office to themselues, which is onely peculiar to Iesus Christ. How dare such presumptuous priests once vndertake to offer a sacrifice for the sinnes of the quicke and the dead, seeing the offering of that sacrifice caused *the Sonne of God* to sweat clods of water and blood, to endure the infinite wrath of his infinite father, and had he not beene corroborated by the dietie, his body had beene vanquished by death, and captiuated by the power of the graue; if the Sonne of God could not do it but with so much difficultie; proud are the sonnes of *Belial* the Priests of Rome, who seeme to doe it with such facilitie. But I would argue Socratically with them by demanding some questions.

1. First, he that was to offer this sacrifice was to be

be God and man without sinne: I demand whether any of them be God and man; if not then they cannot offer this satisfactorie sacrifice, neither are they after the order of *Melchizedech*. If they say that every one of their priests is God and man, oh how doe they blaspheme? how doe they proclaime themselves of the spawn of Antichrist? *who takes upon him to be God, and exalts himselfe above all that are called Gods.*

2. Thes. 2. 4.

2. Secondly, the Angell told *Daniell*, *Dan. 9.* that Christ should take away sinne by his sacrifice, and the holy Apostle sayes, *Christ offered himselfe an oblation and sacrifice to God of a sweet smelling savour.* So that this sacrifice could be offered of none but Christ. Are they so many Christs?

Eph. 5. 2.

3. Thirdly, there was but one high Priest at once among the Jewes, to signifie that there was but one high Priest that could take away our sinnes by offering a satisfactory sacrifice. But are not they innumerable?

4. Fourthly, hee that offered this sacrifice was to be of no lesse dignitie and worth then the sacrifice it selfe, seeing a sacrifice is accepted for his sake that offers it. But dares the masse priest say he is himselfe of equall dignitie with the sacrifice he offers: or that it is accepted for his sake? No not for his eares.

Lastly the sacrifice that the Priest offers in the masse, either is the same that Christ offered or another; if it be another, then it is not propitiatory, seeing the true satisfactory sacrifice was but one according to the text, *having offered one sacrifice.* If it be the same, why then doe they make the sacrifice of Christ imperfect

Heb. 10. 1.

and weake by their so often reiteration; yea, why doe they make the Scripture false which sayes,, *Having offered one sacrifice once for all.* And as the Leviticall sacrifices being so frequently repeated did shew that they were in themselves imperfect, and *could neuer make the commers hereunto perfect*; so doth the often repetition of the sacrifice of Christ argue the imbecility thereof.

Obiect. But the factors of the Church of Rome will say, that Christ may haue deputies on earth in his stead to offer sacrifice.

Ans. I answer hereunto two wayes. First, I say Christ is not bound to offer any more sacrifice at all, for the oblation of himselfe vpon the crosse did consummate mans redemption, and put an end vnto all typical sacrifices of the law, and to his sacrifice which he was to offer for mans reconciliation. Wherefore seeing Christ is not to offer any more sacrifice, what needes he a deputie to offer sacrifices, where neither seruice is required nor expected, what need is there of a substitute?

2. I answer by the way of admission; let vs grant that Christ is yet to offer sacrifice, or to continue his begonne sacrifice, which is most erroneous. Yet we must consider Christ two wayes. 1. as God. 2. as a Mediatour. As hee is God with the Father, and the holy Ghost, he hath Kings and Magistrates to bee his deputies on earth: therefore they are called *Elohim*, Gods. But as he is a Mediatour he hath neither deputie nor vicegerent, neither king to rule ouer his Church, nor priest to offer sacrifice for him.

Quest. If they aske what wee doe then with Ministers

sters in the Church of England?

Ans. I answer, wee make them not Mediatours and sacrificing priests (as *Parmenian* the heretick and the papists doe) but we haue them for such purposes as Christ hath commanded, namely, to administer the word and sacraments, to vse prayer and discipline in the Church, which is no part of the office of Christs eternall priesthood, or chiefe sacrificers dignity,

Plainely then doe appeare vnto vs the blasphemie and sacriledge of the Priests of Rome in establishing their massing priesthood, for while they seeke to maintaine their owne glory, they robbe Christ of his; endeauouring to confirme the multiplicity of their priests, they overthrow the singular priesthood of Iesus Christ.

Quest. But heere may bee demanded a question whether the title priest may properly be assigned to a Minister of the new Testament?

Ans. I answer, howsoeuer it bee crept into the Church, yet (as learned *Falke*) it is not a proper title for the ministers of the Gospell, in regard, that wee haue but one Priest Iesus Christ; for the office of the Priest is to offer sacrifice which doth not appertaine to the ministers of Christ Iesus, neither is the name priest any where in the new Testament ascribed vnto the Ministers in respect of their office.

But how then shal we answer to that place of *Paul*,
That I should be the Minister of Iesus Christ, to the Gentiles ministring the Gospell of God, that the offering vp of the Gentiles might be acceptable beeing sanctified through the Holy Ghost. Where the word *hierourgounta* to euangelion; ministring the Gospell, signifies as much

Rom. 15. 16.

Origen. in epist.
ad Rom. lib. 16.
Answ.

as sacrificing the Gospell; and so *Erasmus* translates it, explained by the word following, namely, that the offering of the Gentiles; where it appears that a sacerdotall action is attributed vnto *Paul*, being a minister of the Gospell; and therefore that the title priest may as lawfully and conueniently be ascribed to him. So *Origen*, *Sacrificale opus est annunciare Evangelium*, It is a sacrificall worke to preach the Gospell. I answer vnto the place alleadged out of the Romans (as *Caluin* on the place) that the Apostle speakes there Metaphoricall alluding to the priesthood of *Aaron* and the Leuiticall oblations, that as the priest did offer the oblation that was brought vnto him vnto the Lord: so *Paul* had a carefull desire by the preaching of the Gospell to subdue the affections of the Gentiles, and so to offer them (as it were) a pure and acceptable sacrifice vnto God. So *Origen* and other of the fathers tearme the preaching of the Gospell a priestly or sacrificall worke, not absolutely but comparatiuely and by way of similitude.

Obiect. But here may bee objected these testimonies of Scripture, 1. Pet. 2. 5. 9. Rev. 1. 6. Rev. 20. 6. by which place it appears that there are priests of the new Testament which ought still to offer sacrifice vnto God.

Answ. Vnto these places I answer, that if you consider who these are that are here spoken of, you shall finde them not to be onely the Clergie, but all faithfull Christians which haue not a materiall or external priesthood but a spirituall and an internall, and so they doe offer spirituall sacrifices as I shall shew

shew when I come to speake of the sacrifice that Christ offered. So that these places of scripture doe prooue the popish priesthood not to bee lawfull, nor the title of priest properly to appertaine to the ministers of the Gospell, but onely that all Christians should be spirituall priests to offer spirituall sacrifice to God.

The third and last vse of this point, is that which the Apostle makes; Seeing wee haue not a high Priest, which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities: but was in all points tempted like as we are, without sinne: let vs therefore come boldly vnto the throne of grace, that we may obtaine mercy, and finde grace to helpe in time of need: and againe, Having therefore, brethren, boldnesse to enter into the holiest by the blood of Iesus; By a new and liuing way which he hath consecrated for vs, through the vail; that is to say, His flesh: And hauing an high Priest ouer the house of God: Let vs draw neere with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, hauing our hearts sprinkled from an euill conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Seeing Christ Iesus whom the Father had decreed from all eternity, did from euertlasting giue himselfe a sacrifice for our transgressions, and when the fulnesse of time was come, by vertue of his priesthood did offer vp himselfe and offering of a sweet smelling sacrifice vnto God for vs; Oh then let vs with wonder admire the infinite loue of God that spared not his owne sonne; the infinite compassion of his sonne, that spared not his owne life, but shed his blood plentifully for our saluation. Let vs with boldnesse, confidence, and assurance flye vnto our high Priest Christ Iesus, who

Vse 3.

Heb. 4. 15. 16.
Heb. 10. 19. 20.
21. 22.

is entered into the Sanctu Sanctoru, there presenting his sacrifice before his father, making request for vs. The children of God therefore ought with much alacrity to cherish themselves in all their worldly troubles and affliction, seeing they haue such a high Priest as hath overcome the gates of hell, the strength of the graue, and the power of sinne, that they shall neuer preuaile against his elect. Let not Satan terrifie thee, for our Sampson hath slaine the deuouring Lyon; hee that is the strongest of all hath bound that strong man, and payled him of his weapons. Let not death cause thee to startle, for Christ triumpheth ouer the graue, Ob death where is thy sting, oh graue where is thy victory? Let not the multitude of thy sinnes affright thee, for if any man sinne, we haue an advocate with the Father, Iesus Christ the righteous. But let vs bee assured, that the head being entered into the most holy place, will at length draw all the members after it, to make them partakers with it of glory and immortality. Thus much for the first part who was the Priest.

Now followes the second, what was the sacrifice? In the declaration whereof for our better vnderstanding I shall propound to my selfe this Methode.

First, to speake somewhat of a sacrifice in generall, and of the kinds of sacrifices.

2. To shew what this particular sacrifice was.

3. To shew the necessity of this sacrifice.

First to speake of sacrifices in generall.

Sacrifice was instituted by God for the vse of man after his fall; for it is thought that if man had not sinned, there had neuer beene any institution of sacrifice. The persons imployed in sacrificing were

men; for as the Apostle under the Gospel, would let
no hand permit a woman to execute the publike mi-
nisteriall function, because she was not first in creation,
though first in transgression; so from the beginning
in the Church of God the act of sacrificing hath bin
practised onely by men; for the better shadowing
foorth of Christ the Messiah whom in that action
they represented. The action of sacrificing was ac-
counted so sacred and so honourable, that before the
promulgation of the law the chiefest persons were im-
ployed in it, and vnder the law onely those who were
separated from the people and set a part for that end
and purpose. Yea among the Infidels (who did apish-
ly imitate, and heathenishly abuse that sacred cere-
mony) sacrifice was offered onely by some choice per-
sons; yea *pleraque sacra a solis regibus obiri consuevit*;
the most of their sacrifices were offered of their kings
alone. And of that iudgement was *Clement Alexand-
rinus*, who sayes, that the Egyptians (who exceeded
all the heathen in abundance and variety of sacrifici-
ces) did not commit their mysteries to euery one amongst
them, &c. but to those onely which were to come to the go-
uernment of their kingdome; and to the Priests, of such
as were approoued for education, learning, and lineage.
And so the word *Cohen* signifies both a Prince and a
Priest; to intimate that the priestly office did not vn-
become a prince, for *Melchisedech* was king of *Salem*,
and Priest of the most high God. Thus much in a word
of the persons imployed in the act of sacrificing.
Now what a sacrifice is. By a sacrifice is sometimes in
scripture vnderstood the act of sacrificing; sometimes
the thing ordained to be sacrificed; and indeed both
these

1. Cor. 14. 34.

1. Tim 2.12.

Funer. de fa-
cerd. Rom. ca. 11

*Rex idem homi-
num Phœbique
sacerdos.*

WB 232-
critice is.

AL. 70. 1
1. 1. 1. 1. 1.

Zanc. 20m. 4. de
cultu Dei ex.
terno pag. 425.
6. 475.

11. 1. 1. 1. 1.

Gen. 4. 4. 1.
11. 1. 1. 1. 1.

11. 1. 1. 1. 1.
11. 1. 1. 1. 1.
11. 1. 1. 1. 1.

Rom. 14. 23. 1.

these concur to the making of a sacrifice; it may therefore be thus defined.

A sacrifice is a sacred and religious action instituted by God whereby we offer some externall thing vnto the true God, which we know will be acceptable vnto him. I called it a sacred religious action instituted by God, because it was a part of Gods worship prescribed vnto the Fathers before the writing of the law in Sinai, and taught by them vnto their children from age to age, and after the deliuering of the law commanded expressly to the people of Israel. Againe, it was a sacred and religious action, because it was to bee performed holily and religiously to Gods glory, the edification of the Church, and the saluation of the person offering. Againe, I say it is the offering of some external thing: as *Abel of the firstlings of his flock, &c.* For it must be some outward visible thing animate or inanimate. I speake of the sacrifices of the law, and not of the Gospell, which I shall shew to be as well internall as externall. I say moreover that it must be offered to the true God; and therefore all sacrifices offered by the Heathens vnto their Idolls and fained gods are improperly called sacrifices, in regard that it can neuer be called sacred which tends to the dishonour of the true God. Furthermore I say there must bee ioyned with this, Knowledge; for there can be no acceptable sacrifice vnto God, which is done ignorantly, without the knowledge of Gods holy will; the Apostle sayes *whatsoever is not of faith is sinne.* And *without faith it is impossible to please God;* now faith cannot subsist without the knowledge of that which we doe beleue. Lastly I say it must bee a thing

thing acceptable to God. Therefore the price of a whore, the price of blood, a dogs head, swines blood, and the like, though they were offered yet are they abominable, because they are forbidden, yea whatsoever is unseemly or indecent is not acceptable.

The leuiticall sacrifices of two sorts.

The Leuiticall sacrifices were of two sorts *Nastika* expiatory, or *Eucharistika* Gratulatory. In the expiatory, propitiatory, or satisfactory sacrifice (for these different titles belong all to one thing) the Jewes had respect vnto their finnes, and by the laying their hand on the beast, and slaying it before the Lord, they did in act confesse that they themselves had deserved death eternall for their finnes, but by the blood of Iesus Christ the immaculate lambe who was to dye for mankind, they were assured to receiue remission of their finnes, and freedome from eternall death. This sacrifice was called *Catat*, that is sinne, or a sacrifice for sinne. So *Paul* alluding hereto saith, that *God hath made him sinne for vs who knew no sinne*, that is to say, *God made him a sacrifice for sinne*. It is also called *Nastikon*, or expiatory from the end for the which it was instituted, namely to represent the sacrifice which should exiate and satisfie for our finnes, which was Christ himselfe. So that this sacrifice was called *Expiatory*, not properly but *Metonymically*, as hauing relation to the Messiah. Vnto his sacrifice were referred that offering which was called *Holococaustum* of *Olon* and *chano*, because it was all burnt in the fire, and the priests had no part of it; or else it was so called * of *Holab*, which signifies to ascend, because it being wholly consumed in the fire, did ascend vp vnto God in the smoake. Vnto this

*Zanch. de sacri-
ficiis Iudeorum.
1. Cor. 5. 21.*

* Or *Gnolab*.

Expiatory sacrifice were also referred those oblations which were offered for the cleansing of lepers, for the purification of women after childbirth, for touching of dead bodies, for the sanctifying of Priests for all these pollutions had respect to the pollution of sinnes.

The other sacrifices were *Eucharistica*; or offerings of thanksgiving, whereby they did testifie their thankfulnesse for benefits temporall or spirituall; this kind of sacrifice was called *Zehach Schelamin*, *sacrificium pacificorum*; a peace offering, because it was offered by them that had (beeing reconciled to God by the former sacrifice) received remission of their sinnes, and were at peace with God: as also because thereby they testified their gratitude to God for all his fauours, which the *Hebrewes* did comprize vnder the word Peace.

And to this sacrifice were referred the *meate offerings*, and *drinke offerings*, the *first fruits* and the *tenths* all which were testimonies of their thankfulnes.

And indeed all sacrifices may be reduced to these two heads. Either *Ilastika*, or *Eucharistika*, *Expiatory*, or *Gratulatorie*. For according vnto Gods affection towards man, such were mens sacrifices towards God. Now God is either angry with vs and so punisheth vs; or is well pleased and so blesteth vs; and all the effects of God vpon euery man are either blessings or cursings; when hee is angry, hee sends cursings; when hee is well pleased, hee sends blessings; wherefore hauing stirred him vp to wrath by sinnes, the *Iewes* offered *Ilasticke* sacrifices to appease his wrath; hauing appeased his anger and pleasing him

by obeying his commandements, they obtained his blessings and fauours to their bodies and soules, wherefore they offered *Eucharisticke* sacrifices to testify their thankfulness to the Lord.

Now in both these kinds of sacrifices had the Jews respect vnto the Messiah, fixing the eye of their faith vpon Christ that was to come, both in him expecting saluation by the satisfactory sacrifice of his death, and in him rendering thanks vnto *tebanah* for all his blessings which they were made partakers of through the Messiah.

Thus much of a sacrifice in generall, and of the kind of sacrifices among the Iewes.

The second thing I propounded is to shew you what this particular sacrifice is which Christ offered for sinne.

As there was vnder the law a double sacrifice *Ilasticum* and *Eucharisticum*, Expiatory and Gratulatory: So is there vnder the Gospell this double sacrifice offered by Christ: for when he had finished his Prophetickall office here on earth, he then entered vpon his Pontificall or Priestly office, which was to offer sacrifice for all beleeuers. And albeit this expiatory sacrifice was first in order of nature, as making way for the Eucharistickall, whereby it might be acceptable to God, hauing satisfied for sinne by his death, and so reconciling God and man: yet in time his Eucharistickall sacrifice was offered before his Expiatory; and the reason hereof is alleadged by a most famous Diuine, whose words are these, *Although the Father was first to be appeased by the Ilastickall sacrifice of Christ vpon the crosse, and so forgiveness of*

Why the order
supper was
called by the
Fathers the
Eucharist.

Christ offered
a double sa-
crifice.

Zach. de cultu
Dei externo.

Reu. 13. 8.

Why the Lords
Supper was
called by the
Fathers the
Eucharist.

sinne, and of punishment being obtained, then should
haue followed the sacrifice of thanksgiving for all bene-
fits obtained by Christs death and passion; yet Christ
offers his sacrifice of thanksgiving, as if hee were al-
ready crucified. For so he was indeed in Gods decree
and in his determination; and in this respect hee is
called, *The lambe slain from the beginning of the
world.*

This Eucharisticall sacrifice of Christ was in the
Lords Supper, which was not vnworthily euer after
in the Church of God by the Fathers tearmed by the
name of the Eucharist. Yet vnderstand mee; I doe
not say that the bread and the cup were this Eucha-
risticall sacrifice that Christ offered, but the thanks-
giving which he offered to his father. For before hee
brake the bread and gaue the cup to his Disciples, it
is the opinion of all ancient and moderne writers,
that lifting vp his eyes vnto heauen, in the name of
all the elect that were, are and euer shall bee in the
world, he gaue thanks to his heavenly Father for all
his blessings of nature, grace and glory, but especially
for that remission of sinnes and redemption from e-
ternall death purchased by that sacrifice of his body
vpon the crosse. So that in these two sacrifices of
Christ all the Leviticall sacrifices had their full perfe-
ction and accomplishment. Therefore the Apostle
sayes (*Ephes. 5. 2.*) that Christ gaue himselfe *Proprio*
ran *Kathousian*, an oblation and a sacrifice. by an obla-
tion vnderstanding a gratulatory offering, and by sa-
crifice an expiatory host for sinne. And that the
Leviticall sacrifices had their consummation in
Christ, appears in that figuratiue calling the open
and

and drove out of the Temple, as Theophylact. on the 21. chapter of Math. observeth, saying, *Iesus eiecit de boues & columbas, praesignans non ultra opus esse animalium sacrificio, sed oratione*, Iesus casting the oxen and dones out of the Temple, signified that there should no longer need the sacrifice of beast, but of prayer.

But it is demanded, which of these two sacrifices it is that the Apostle speaks of. The text it self clears this doubt, you heard before that the Eucharisticall sacrifices were for mercies and blessings received, and the Ilasticke or Expiatorie sacrifices were for sinnes committed; so that when the Apostle sayes, this sacrifice was for sinne, it plainly appeares that hereby is meant the Expiatory sacrifice of Christ offered to appease his Fathers wrath.

This sacrifice is no other then Christ himselfe, dying upon the crosse for the transgressions of mankind. Origen speaking of Christ, sayes, *Ipsa est hostia Sancta Sanctorum. He is the most holy sacrifice for his body ones*. Which the Apostle Saint Peter confirms, saying, For so much as ye know that you were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold; But by the precious blood of Christ, as of a lambe without blemish or without spot. Christ himselfe was this sacrifice, who so loved us, that he gave himselfe for us. an offering and sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour.

1. Pet 1. 18 19
Ephes 5. 2

But according to which nature was Christ the sacrifice for sinnes?

Quest.

Onely according to his humane nature, as appeares, By which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ once for all, by which words (the

Answe
Hebr 1. 9 10

The whole
manhood of
Christ thy
sacrifice.
Esa. 53. 10.

Why the man-
hood of Christ
must be this
sacrifice.
Reas. I.

body of Christ) we are to understand the whole hu-
mane nature of Christ, for there the part is put for
the whole; so that Christ the man consisting of body
and soule was the sacrifice for our finnes, and as
we in soule and body had transgressed against God,
so Christ both in soule and body was to suffer punish-
ment, and to make satisfaction for our offences. Com-
pare this place of the Hebrews with the words of the
Prophet Esa. and you shall easily discover this truth,
*Yet it pleased God to bruiſe him, hee hath put him to
griefe: when thou shalt make his soule an offering for
sinne, he shall see his seede, he shall prolong his dayes, and
the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. What
the Prophetical Apostle Paul attributes to the body,
the Evangelicall Prophet Esa. attributes to the soule,
so that both these being essentiall parts of man, make
the whole humanitie of Christ to bee the sacrifice for
our finnes. And as the Tree of life did represent the
Godhead of the Messiah: so did the Animate sacrific-
es of the Leviticall law shadow out his Manhood.*

And the reasons why this sacrifice that Christ offe-
red should be his manhood are these.

I. Because that in the same nature the offence
was made, in the same nature was the sacrifice to bee
offered, and the satisfaction to bee performed, for o-
therwise Gods iustice could not be appeased: but in
the nature of man was a transgression committed,
therefore in mans nature must a sacrifice bee offered
and satisfaction made. And for this reason the An-
gels that fell from God had no benefit by the Incar-
nation of Christ, nor by his death and passion, be-
cause he tooke not vpon him their nature, neither in
their

their nature did he offer sacrifice.

2. Secondly, the death of the beasts in the Ceremoniall law did figure out the death of that sacrifice which the Sonne of God was to offer unto his Father for mans Redemption. So that in that nature wherein Christ dyed, in that nature he was a sacrifice: but Christ as he was God could not dye, yet the Godhead is *apathes*, and cannot suffer; but according to his humanitie he dyed truly, and not fantastically, and in shew onely, as *Martin* and the *Martines* heretically thought. And indeed considering Gods eternall decree of sending his Sonne to be *made flesh*, it was necessarily required that he should dye and shed his blood to appease his Fathers wrath, and to procure forgiveness of sinnes for all beleeuers: for according to the words of the Apostle, *where is redemption without bloodshedding is no remission*. So it appears, that the humane nature of Christ consisting of soule and body was the sufficient sacrifice for the sinnes of all beleeuers.

Heb. 9. 22.

The necessity of the sacrifice of Christ.

3. The third thing propounded is the necessity of this sacrifice. Adam being seduced by his wife, and eating the forbidden fruit brought vpon himselfe and all his posteritie three evils.

First, hee was by his transgression guilty of sinne before God.

Secondly, hee was deprived of all his grace of integrity and righteousness which God had conferred vpon him in his creation.

Thirdly, hee was driven out of Paradise, to signify his banishment from the celestiall Paradise. Wherefore it was necessary that there should be a sacrifice offered

offered for man.

First, that his sinnes might be remitted whereby he was turned from God.

Secondly, that he might be restored againe to the state of grace.

Thirdly, that he might be reunited and reconciled vnto God, and inherite eternall life.

These three were effected by the sacrifice of Christ.

For first by this Sacrifice our sinnes are pardoned, and the guilt of all our iniquities is washed away by the blood of Iesus: hec was that promised for sinne which should be set open for iuda and ierusalem to wash in. This appeares by the words of Paul, *Traditus est in mortem propter offensas nostras, He was delivered to death for our offences.*

Secondly, by this sacrifice wee are made partakers of his grace, whereby wee are comely in the eyes of God the Father, for hec thereby imputed his righteousness vnto vs, and communicated that life of grace which was radically in himselfe the head, vnto all his faithfull members: for by him it is that wee all receiue grace for grace.

Thirdly, hereby are wee entitled againe vnto the kingdome of heauen lost by our first parents: for when this earthly tabernacle is dissolved, we are put into possession of that building of God not made with hands which endures for ever in heauen. All these three are contained in one verse. Christ Iesus is made vnto vs of God, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. Righteousnesse in the forgiveness of our sinnes, Sanctification in the communication of his grace, and Redemption in the salvation of our soules and bodies.

Zachar. 13. 1.
Rom. 4. 25.

2. Cor. 5. 1.

1. Cor. 1. 30.

dies. By this that hath beene spoken wee may note that the beginning, middle, and end of mans happinesse is from the sacrifice of Christ; by him wee are deliuered from the bondage of sinne; by him wee are in the liberty of grace, by him are wee eſtated in glory.

By him we haue our fetters knockt off, and our filthy rags caſt away; by him we are arrayed with rich apparrell of holines and innocencie; by him wee are brought into his fathers preſence and are accepted of God Almighty. Through him we haue our *Iuſtification*; through him we haue our *Sanctification*; through him we haue our *Glorification*.

Seeing then the ſaluation of all beleeuers is perfectly wrought and conſummated by the ſacrifice of Chriſt, here may ariſe a queſtion.

Queſt. Whether there be any ſacrifices to bee offered by Chriſtians vnder the Goſpell or no?

Anſw. I anſwer, there are not any Ilaſticke or propitiatory ſacrifices to bee offered for attonement with God; for to that end Chriſt *both offered himſelfe once for all*. But as you haue heard that all Chriſtians are ſpirituall Priests, ſo they haue ſpirituall ſacrifices to offer ſtill vnto God; which ſacrifices are theſe.

Fiſt, a broken and a contrite heart, *The ſacrifices of God are a broken ſpirit: a broken and a contrite heart* *Oh Lord thou wilt not deſpiſe*, without this ſacrifice all others are abhominable in the ſight of God.

Spirituall ſacrifices.

Pſal. 51. 17.

Secondly the offering vp of beleeuers *per leuourgi- an miniſtrorum*, by the ſeruiſe of Gods miniſters; of this Paul ſpeakes, *That I ſhould be the miniſter of Ieſus*

Chriſt

Rom. 15. 6.

Christ to the Gentiles ministring the Gospell of God, that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.

Psal. 141. 2.

Thirdly, al manner of prayer and supplication. Let my prayers be directed before thee as the incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice.

Heb. 13. 15.

Fourthly, all praise and thanksgiving which wee giue vnto God. By him therefore let vs offer the sacrifice of prayse to God continually, that is, the fruits of our lippes giuing thanks to his name. This sacrifice of praise the Orthodox fathers called *anaimon thysian*, an vnbloody sacrifice, as *Athenagoras* in his embassage for the Christians to the Emperours *Antoninus* and

Lib. 2. demonstr.

Commodus. And *Eusebius*, *Offerant illi logikas kai anaimous thysias*. Let them offer a sonable and vnbloody sacrifices So *Cyrill*, *Oecumenicus*, *Iuliane Martyr*, *Clementis Alexandrinus*, fathers of great antiquitie, called the heauenly *Halleluias* of Angels, and the holy hymnes of the Saints acceptable vnbloody sacrifices.

Heb. 13. 16.

Fiftly, our almes and reliefe of the poore, are spirituall sacrifices, To doe good and to distribute forget not for with such sacrifices God is well pleased. And *Paul* calls the beneuolence of the *Philippians* sent by *Ephroditus*, an odor of a sweet smell, and a sacrifice acceptable well pleasing to God.

Phil. 4. 18.

Psal. 4. 5.

Psal. 51. 19.

Sixtly there is the sacrifice of righteousness or iustice, Offer to God the sacrifices of righteousness; and againe, Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness.

Seauenthy there is the slaying of our finnes, and offering them vp dead vnto the Lord with there signation

nation of our selues to Gods seruice, I beseech you therefore brethren by the mercies of God that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your reasonable seruice.

Eighthly, the bodily death of the Martyrs inflicted on them by bloody tyrants is a spirituall sacrifice. Thus *Paul* calls himselfe a Sacrifice. *Yea if I bee offered up a sacrifice for the seruice of your faith.* And I take it in this sense, it is the Prophet *Dauid* speakes saying. *Precious in the sight of God is the death of his Saints.* Thus did that holy *Polycarpe* the Disciple of Saint *Iohn*, call his death which hee indured for the testimony of Iesus a Sacrifice. And so Saint *Augustine* speaking of the Martyrs hath these words. *The Gentils dedicated Temples, consecrated Priests, erected altars, and offered sacrifices to their gods. We Christians dedicate Temples to our Martyrs, not as to Gods, but to their memories as to dead men; whose spirits liue with the Lord. Neither doe we erect altars whereon we sacrifice to the Martyrs, but to one God theirs and ours. Wee offer sacrifice, at which sacrifices those Martyrs as men of God are named in their place and order; nor are they inuocated by him that offers the sacrifice, for the sacrifice is not made to them but to God, although it be in the remembrance of them, for he is the minister of God and not theirs; and the sacrifice is the body of Christ, which is not offered vnto them, for they themselves are that body.* In the latter end of which words Saint *Augustine* shewes that the whole Church which is the mysticall body of Christ (whereof the Martyrs are a part) is a gratefull sacrifice acceptable vnto God.

Phil. 2. 17.
Psal. 116. 15.
Euseb. lib. 4. c. 15

Aug. tom. 5. lib. 22. cap. 10. de ciuitate Dei.

Dial. cum troy-
phone Iudeo, p.
201. & 269.
ed. 11. Comel.

Aug. lib. 10. ca. 5.
de ciuitat. Dei. 7

Lastly, the sacrament of the Lords supper is a sacrifice (but not after the manner of the Papists) but onely figuratiuely. So the bread and cup are called the sacrifices of Christians by *Iustine Martyr*; because they represent the sacrifice of Christ, and were instituted in remembrance of it. So *Dionysius* calls it *Symbolike ierourgia* *Symbolicum Sacrificium*. *Eccles. Hiero. cap. 30. a Symbolicall sacrifice*. So Saint *Augustine*, *Quod ab omnibus appellatur sacrificium, signum est verum sacrificii*. That which by all men is called a sacrifice, is but a signe of the true sacrifice. And that immolation which is in the hands of the Priest, is called the passion, death, and crucifixion of Christ: not that it is so indeed and in truth, but onely by the way of remembrance. So that the Sacrament of the Lords Supper may be called *Sacrificium mnemonikon*, a *Recordatory Sacrifice*, wherein vsing the signes and Symbols of his body and blood, with true faith, and thankfull hearts we celebrate the memoriall of the death and sacrifice of our Saviour Iesus Christ. Wherefore the Fathers called it an vnbloody sacrifice, because it was not a proper sacrifice, but onely mysticall and figuratiue.

And indeed this makes it not to bee properly a sacrifice; because in a sacrifice we giue vnto God, but in a Sacrament wee receiue from God; but in the Lords Supper wee giue not the body and blood of Christ vnto God, but receiue it from the minister as from Christ for the confirmation of our faith, which makes it to be properly and truely a sacrament: but a sacrifice it is called improperly and by representation. Thus you see what was the sacrifice offered by Christ,

Christ, and what are the spirituall sacrifices of euery Christian.

Now followes the third branch of this first part of the text. Namely, the cause why Christ offered this sacrifice, or the end whereunto this sacrifice was directed, which is said here to be for sinne.

The end of Christs sacrifice.

But this man hauing offered one sacrifice for sinne.

Here we are to note that albeit the Angels had sinned as well as man, yet it was not for their sinne that Christ offered sacrifice (for they had no benefite by his incarnation, death, or passion) but for the sinnes of mankind; and withall we are to obserue that albeit Christ was a man endued with true humane nature, yet in regard he was not a sinnetull man but a *lambe without blemish and without spot*, a lambe for his innocencie of nature, and without blemish for integritie of conuersation, therefore hee needed no sacrifice to be offered for him to purge his sinne, as all men els doe, but onely offered in behalfe of all beleeuers.

Note

1. Pet. 1. 19.

Therefore we may safely affirme that Christ receiued no benefit by his owne sacrifice in respect of remission of his sinnes; for seeing hee was without sin, he needed no sacrifice to bee offered for himselfe. Wherefore the actiue obedience of Christ to the law did appertaine both to the elect, and to himselfe: to the elect that the law might be fulfilled by Christ for them; to himselfe, for as hee was a creature after the image of God, so was hee bound to obey the law of his creatour: but his passiue obedience appertaineth onely to the faithfull, seeing he had not sinned: therefore he deserved no punishment, and hauing not transgressed needed no sacrifice to bee offered for him.

Christ receiued no benefite by his owne sacrifice.

Dan. 9. 26.

Cancilium Ephe
sinum.

himselfe. This appeares by the word of the Angell
Gabriel vnto Daniell. And after threescore and two
weekes the Messiah shall be slaine, but not for himselfe.
Thereupon worthily did the Council of Ephesus
stablish this Canon, *Si quis dicat Christum pro se obtu-
lisse sacrificium, & non magis pro nobis solum; Anathe-
ma sit. If any man shall say that Christ did offer an obla-
tion for himselfe, and not rather for vs alone, let him be
accursed.*

For vs then it is that Christ offered sacrifice and for
our sinne.

Quest. But what sinne?

Ans. All finnes of the elect, originall and actu-
all; of omission and commission; of weakenesse and
willfulnesse; before their conuersion, and since their
conuersion; whatsoever is *anomia*, a transgression of
the law, is by this sacrifice of Christ expiated; yea
the sinne against the Holy Ghost albeit it be not at a-
ny time actually pardoned, yet there is so much me-
rit and worth in this sacrifice as to deserue the par-
don of it, if the party committing it could come to re-
pentance. Not that that sinne can bee or is at any
time pardoned, because of the incredulitie and im-
penitencie of the sinner, but that the sinne in it selfe
considered cannot be so great, but the mercy of God
is able to pardon it; and the merits of Christ in this
sacrifice are of such sufficiencie as to deserue remissi-
on and giue satisfaction for it.

Now whereas it is said to be a sacrifice for sinne, it
offers to our obseruation three things.

Obser. i.

First, the heinousnesse and abhominablenesse of
sinne; euery sinne be it neuer so small is both so odi-
ous

ous in the eyes of God and iniurious to his diuine law, that nothing can expiate it but the death and sacrifice of the Sonne of God: why then shall any Christian take pleasure in sinne, which drew Christ Iesus from his throne of Maiestie, and fastned him to the crosse, which caused him to shed his precious blood, and to giue his life as a ranfome for the sons of men. As the burthen of our sinnes were well nigh vnto Christ intolerable, so let the practise of them be vnto vs detestable. Let vs neither extenuate their number nor their nature; for the smallest sin though but once done is committed against a God of an infinite maiestie, and deserues an infinite punishment, and could not be satisfied for, but by the infinite sacrifice of the Sonne of God Christ Iesus.

[or Secondly, we may obserue heere the insufficiencie of all other sacrifices both before and vnder the law, for they were not able to purge the sinnes of the offenders; and therefore to speake properly there was neuer but one true Ilasticke and propitiatory sacrifice for sinne, which Christ Iesus offered when he gaue his body vpon the crosse for our redemption. And therefore doth the Apostle call this sacrifice of Christ *kat exochen* above all others *thu sian to theo*, is *oumen enodiaz*, a sacrifice to God yet a sweeter smelling *suour*. Thereby intimating that this sacrifice being most gratefull to God, in it alone was God well pleased.

to *Obiect*. But here may be objected, *Nob* after the waters were abated off the earth, and that at Gods command he was come forth of the Aike, yhee tooke of euery cleane beast, and of euery cleane soule, and offe-

Obfer-2.

Gen. 8. 21.

red

Exod. 29. 18.

red burnt offerings on the altar, and the Lord smelled a sweet savour. And againe, Exod. 29. 18. The offerings that are made for the consecration of the Priests are called sweet savours unto the Lord.

Amos 5. 21. 22.

Isa. 1. 13. 14.

Isa 66. 3.

Ans. I answer, these sacrifices are to be considered two wayes, either in themselves, or as they have relation to Christ. As they were considered in themselves, so they had no sweet savour in the nostrills of God; because they were but earthly things, and of a finite vertue; and therefore doth the Lord often complaine against those that reposed confidence only in the outward ceremony of sacrificing, whose oblations were an abomination to him. But as these offerings had relation to the sacrifice of Christ, and were offered by faith in his sacrifice, so they were acceptable unto God, and God did smell a sweet sauer in them; not for themselves but for the Antitype Christ Iesus who was figured by them; and therefore it is said that *By faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice then Cain.* Not but that *Cains* might in value equall *Abels*, but because *Abel* offered by faith in Christ, and *Cain* without faith: And as the Leviticall sacrifices of the law were onely accepted in Christ, so and no otherwise are our spirituall sacrifices of the Gospell, yee also as lining stones are built up

Micah 6. 6.

Heb. 11. 4.

a spirituall house, an holy Presthood to offer up spirituall sacrifice, acceptable to God by Iesus Christ. By which it appeares that all our sacrifices and seruices are to be presented before God, onely in the perfection of this al-sufficient sacrifice of Iesus Christ.

Obser. 3.

Thirdly, obserue we here the perfection of this sacrifice, in that there was nothing in sinne, but the

con-

contrary might bee found in this sacrifice. In sinne there is imperfection, in this sacrifice perfection; in sinne disobedience, in this sacrifice obedience; in sinne carnall delight and pleasure, in this sacrifice vnspeakable torture and torment; in sinne pride, in this sacrifice humilitie; in sinne enuy, in this sacrifice loue; in sinne mans destruction, in this sacrifice mans restoration; in sinne death, in this sacrifice life. So that wheresoeuer sinne had made a breach, this sacrifice of Christ makes it vp, giuing full satisfaction for euery default.

Quest. But here will arise a great question which of late hath troubled the Church of God, and it is this. Seeing here it is laide downe indefinitely that Christ offered one sacrifice for sinne; Whether did Christ offer a propitiatory sacrifice to satisfie for the sinnes of all men; as well reprobates as elects.

Answ. The Arminians are of opinion that Christ by the sacrifice of his death obtained remission of sins, reconciliation and saluation for all and particular men. Nor doe they doubt to say, that by the death of Christ, reconciliation was obtained for Cain, Pharaoh, Saul and Iudas, not as they were reprobates but as they were sinners: for God (say they) doth equally intend and desire the saluation of all men; and the incredulitie of man is the cause that remission and reconciliation is not applyed to all. They hold moreover that the end which God propounded to himselfe in deliivering his Sonne to death was not to apply the benefit of remission to some particular men; nor doe they thinke that Christ was appointed to death by his Father before God thought of saving men. One

*Petri Molin.
Anatom. Armi-
nianismi.*

Greunichowius,
pag. 21.

of them sayes, That reconciliation being obtained, there was yet no necessitie of application; that is, after saluation and reconciliation for almes was obtained, there was no necessitie that any one should be saued; because hee will haue the decree of sending Christ in order to goe before the Decree of sauing those that beleue; therefore that God intended to send his Sonne, when as yet hee had not intended to saue them that beleue. And the *Arminians* would haue this to be the end why God sent his Son, namely, to make the saluation of men possible, and to lay open a way to himselfe whereby hee might saue sinners, without any preiudice to his Iustice; (by this meanes say they) God hath gotten power of sauing man, because without the death of Christ, by which the iustice of God was satisfied, God could not bee willing to saue man.

But the Truth bids vs be of another opinion. We doe acknowledge that Christ dyed for all men; but we deny that by the death of Christ saluation and forgiveness of sinne is obtained for all men: or that reconciliation is made for *Cain, Pharaoh, Sodom, &c.* Neither doe we think that remission of sinnes is obtained for any one whose sinnes are not remitted; or that saluation was purchased for him whom God from eternitie hath decreed to condemn. We deny that election is after the death of Christ, seeing Christ doth euery where affirme that he dyed for his sheep, and for those whom his Father gaue him.

And when we say that Christ dyed for all, we take it thus, that the death of Christ is sufficient to saue who soeuer doe beleue; yea and that it is sufficient

to save all men that ever were, are, or shall bee if they did beleue in him; and that the cause why all men are not saved is not the insufficiency of the death of Christ, but the incredulity of man.

Whosoever therefore shall say that Christ offered his body an expiatory sacrifice for the finnes of euery particular man, as of *Pharaoh*, *Cain* and *Judas*; hee doth by this doctrine openly mocke God: for Christ is imagined to obtaine that from his Father which he knew would neuer profit; as if God should grant to his Sonne the saluation of that man, which from eternity he decreed to condemne; for if Christ obtained reconciliation and remission of finnes for *Cain* or *Judas*, whether considered as reprobates or as sinners, yet he knew this reconciliation and remission should neuer be applyed vnto them; and therefore their doctrine is as if Christ should say vnto his Father, *I pray thee receiue to fauour those whom I know thou wilt neuer receiue into fauour, and whom I know certainly to be condemned.* For Christ as God knew full well the secrets of election.

Surely these men doe their endeauour that Christian Religion should be made a mocking stocke. Can God at one and the same time loue and hate a man? Loue him because he giueth his Sonne for him, and would haue reconciliation obtained for him: hate him because from eternitie he decreed to condemne him. Can God be so vniust as to punish one offence twice? For once Christ (as the Arminians teach) sustained the punishment of *Pharaoh* and *Judas*, and for them made satisfaction vpon the crosse, yet for the same sins doe the same persons suffer eternall death.

Ioh. 3. 16.

Object. To strengthen their tottering and declining cause they allcadge scripture, *God so loved the world, &c.* which place they rest to prooue Christs dying for all men, whereas indeed by the world Christ vnderstandeth the noblest and most worthy creatures as in the sequel of the verse, *That al those that beleue in him might not perishe but haue everlasting life.* Where what was obscure by the generall tearme of the world is explained by its restriction onely vnto the faithfull, and in this sense is the word *World* vsed. *Ioh. 6. 33.* But albeit we grant that by the world is vnderstood mankind in generall, yet it will not follow that Christ purchased saluation for all particular men, but that he came to saue the whole nature of man, though not all persons, for in that hee redeemed some men, it doth abundantly testifie the loue of God to mankind.

Ioh. 6. 33.

Ioh. 1. 29.

1. Cor. 15. 22.

Object. 2. They assault vs with the words of Saint *John Baptist, Behold the lambe of God which taketh away the sinnes of the world:* but hereby wee are to vnderstand that in the whole world no mans finnes are remitted but by Christ: as in the same sense Saint *Paul* speakes, *In Christ all men are made aliuie,* because no man is made aliuie but by him. If a man say that *Hypocrates* taught all Greece and Italy Physicke; hee doth not say that all particular men, each seuerall person in Greece or Italy learned of him; but that no man learned Physicke but from him.

Thesis

Not to trouble you with many arguments, the Thesis or true Position of this doctrine is this: That *Christ Iesus offered not his body vpon the crosse to bee a propitiatory or satisfactory sacrifice for the sinnes of*

my reprobate, but onely for the finnes of the elect, which have in times past, doe at this present, and shall hereafter, beleue in Christ and attaine to true repentance. This benefite then of Christs sacrifice is onely confined to beleeuers, as the Apostle manifests, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood; whereby it appears that there is no propitiation without faith, and consequently no obtaining of reconciliation.

Rom. 3. 25.

And the same Apostle in the same epistle affordeth a strong testimony for the confirmation of this point, for he sayes, who shall lay any thing to the charge, &c. which place tells vs, that they for whom Christ dyed cannot be condemned, nor can any thing be layed to their charge; but the reprobates are condemned, and something is layed to their charge; therefore Christ dyed not for them: neither did he make satisfaction for their finnes; but onely for such as beleue in him; and for these alone doth he also make intercession, I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me. So that the Ocean of Christs lone in offering of sacrifice and applying it, is bounded within the shoare of beleeuers, not extending it selfe vnto any reprobate; wherefore the Scripture, which is the best expositer of it selfe, shewes that when it sayes, Christ was a propitiation for the finnes of the whole world; meanes not of all men in generall, but makes it plaine by restraining it to some onely, *this is my blood which is shed for many for remission of sins; and the sonne of man came, that he might give his life a redemption for many, and he was offered once for the sins of many.* By this it is plaine that all men haue not

Rom. 8. 33-34.

Ioh. 17. 9.

1. Ioh. 2. 2.

Math. 26. 28.

Heb. 9. vk.

benefite by Christs sacrifice, neither is the guilt of every mans finnes washed away by the blood of this lambe of God, but onely of the elect in Christ who haue, doe, and shall beleue in his holy name. Away then with the erroneous innouation of the Arminians, teaching satisfaction for each particular man. And away with that dolefull conceit of most common people, concerning vniuersall Redemption, whereby they are apt to say, that all men shall be saued, and God forbid that any man should goe to hell, thus out of foolish charitie they iudge contrarie to the opinion of Gods word; for the iudgement of charitie is not alwayes the iudgement of verity.

The Corrolary
or generall
doctrine.

The Priesthood and Sacrifice of Christ with the end of both of them being thus largely and sufficiently explained, I shall thinke it necessary now to draw all that hath beene formerly spoken to this Corrolary which I will lay downe as a generall doctrine collected out of the three parts of the first branch of the text, and it is this: *That Iesus Christ the eternall Sonne of the ever-living God; as God and man was the onely Priest that offered on the crosse his whole humane nature, soule and body, a true and perfect Expiatory sacrifice to satisfie for all the finnes of all true beleeuers; whereby hee wrought their perfect reconciliation with God, and obtained full remission for all their offences.* The which position in euery particular hath beene so fully prooued that it needs no further confirmation; wherefore it shall be necessary to make some application to our selues. The vses to be made of this doctrine are diuers.

Use 1. First, it teacheth vs to consider the true
and

and proper nature of sinne, which is so contrary to the diuine essence of God, so opposite vnto his sacred law, so odious and abhominable in his eyes, so noxious and dangerous to the soule of man, that all the creatures in the world, men and angels, gold and precious iowells, could not appease the wrath of God, or be a propitiatory sacrifice for the atonement and reconciliation of mankind, but onely Iesus Christ, God and man, the eternall Sonne of his Father. Oh then how are most men too blame that esteeme their sinnes as things not worthy regarding, not worthy excepting against; and how are all men to bee condemned, that either for a little gaine, or a small deale of perishing pleasure, will shake no scruple to pollute, hurt, wound and slay their soules with wilfull and knowne wickednesse? Alas, alas, sinne is so hainous in Gods account that all the world is not able to satisfie for it, but onely the eternall Sonne of God, and that by being a sacrifice, and powring forth his precious blood. Well then did sinne draw Christ from the bosome of his father? Did sinne cause him to take our nature vpon him? Did sinne rayle him to the crosse, piercing his hands, his feet, his side? Did sinne take away his blood, and with his blood, his life? Did sinne make him a sacrifice, burning in the flames of his fathers wrath, and crying, *Eli, Eli, Lama sabachthani, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Was sinne the procuring cause of all this his sorrow? Cursed then be that man that shall either looke and delight in sinne, or shall exaltuate and lessen his sinne, esteeming it a slight offender cause why God should cast a man into hell; or (as sinne pierced the heart

heart of Christ shall not bee pricked and pierced at the heart with sorrow and repentance. Put thy sinne in one ballance and the price that was payd for it in the other; and thou shalt soone finde the one to be of infinite weight to presse thee downe to hell; and the other to be of infinite preciousnesse to recouer thee to heaven. This is the first vse of this point for information to teach vs that if Christ were offered a sacrifice for our sinnes; sinne then is not to be esteemed as a slight and slender thing.

vse 2. The second vse of this point is for instruction, to teach vs what loue God the Father hath expressed vnto vs mortalls in that he sent his Sonne to bee a sacrifice for mankind. God commendeth his loue towards vs, *in that while we were yet sinners, Christ dyed for vs.*

Rom. 5. 8.

Great, yea infinite surely was the loue of God, in that when we had reiected him, and giuen heede to the entisements of the Serpent, when we had rased forth his image out of our whole man, and instead thereof had imprinted therein the feature of the Diuell; when we had rebelled against our maker, trampling his law vnder our feete, destroying our owne soules, yet that there should remaine within his bowels a more then fatherly affection towards vs, in so much that he gaue his onely sonne, *that every one that beleueth in him might not perish, but haue everlasting life;* this is loue indeede, farre transcending the loue of any creature, which ought to beget in vs true thankfulnessse and a holy retorsion of loue againe. For, but that God had so much compassion on Adam, as to make ynto him, that promise of the blessed

Joh. 3. 16.

bleſſed ſeede, he and we in him, had beene hopeleſſe and helpeleſſe, not able to get forth of that pit into which we were plunged: ſo that the Lord may ſay vnto Adam, *Perditio tua ex te o Adam, ſaluatio ex me*, Oh Adam thy deſtruction proceedes from thy ſelfe; thy ſaluatio only from me and from my loue. Should not the conſideration of this loue of God plentifully powred out vpon vs, without any deſert on our part, prouoke vs to loue him with all our heartes, withall our ſtrength, withall our power. Why do men loue riches more then God? why doe men loue pleaſure more then God? why do men reioyce more in temporall honour, then in God? Becauſe they call not to minde the loue that God hath ſhewed to mankind, in ſending his ſonne into the world to be a ſacrifice for our finnes. Hath God ſo manifested his loue, and ſhall it be ſo buried in obliuion? *O conſider this yee that forget God, leaſt I tear you in peeces, and there be none to deliuer you.*

Hofea 13. 9.

Pla. 50. 21.

Here as God the father hath manifested his compaſſion; ſo God the Sonne Ieſus Chriſt hath declared his prompt and ready affection to vs poore ſinners, in that ſponte of his owne free-will, he was pleaſed to take vpon him that arduous and painefull office of priethood, and to effect that ſtupendious worke of our redemption. That he that was *verbum increatum*, the Word increate, ſhould become *verbum incarnatum*, the Word incarnate: Here was loue without parallell, without compare: Eſpecially if wee conſider that he could not take vpon him the ſhape of a ſeruant, but he muſt infinitely humble himſelfe; and in humbling himſelfe he muſt die for vs, and in

H

dying

Iohn 14. 15.

dying for vs, he must die not for the righteous but for sinners; and if the wordes of Christ be true, that greater loue there cannot be then that a man should lay downe his life for his friend; how great then is that loue when God shall lay downe his life for his enemies? If Christ hath thus loued vs, let vs labour to loue him againe, and if wee will giue an euident demonstration of our loue to Christ, let vs expresse it by this, euen by our care to keepe his commandments; for so sayes Christ, *If yea loue me, keepe my commandments.* Thus so often as wee meditate on the Priest-hood and sacrifice of Christ, whereby wee receiue remission of sinnes, and reconciliation, wee should in them as in a glasse behold the incomprehensible compassion of God our father, and the unspeakable loue of Christ our Saviour.

use 3.

The third vse of this point is for consolation vnto all Gods elect, who are sanctified with the grace of Christ, hauing the eyes of their vnderstandings illuminated, and being renewed in the spirit of their minds, are become new creatures; for to them hath be made an atonement and reconciliation, by his sacrifice and oblation which hee offered vpon the crosse, *once for all.*

Whosoever thou art therefore, that fearest the Lord, and art begotten againe to a lively hope; albeit thou findest in thy selfe many failings and infirmities, and that the burthen of those finnes which thou diddest commit in the dayes of thy vnregeneration, and non-conuersion doe so oppresse thee, as that thou art weary and heavy laden; yet lift vp the eyes of thy faith vnto Christ, hee was the Priest

that

that offered vp his humane nature, an al-sufficient sacrifice for the finnes of all that beleue in him; he felt the sharpe wrath of God against him, but it was for thy finnes, that thou mightest be freed from the wrath to come, *he hath borne thine infirmities, he was broken for thy transgressions; the chastisement of thy peace was layd upon him, and by his stripes thou art healed;* he put himselfe in thy roome, and by the punishment of his soule and body, did free thy soule and body from eternall damnation.

If therefore thou be stung with sinne, Christ is the brazen Serpent exalted on the crosse: lift vp the eyes of faith vnto him, and thou shalt be restored. It was for thy sake that Christ Iesus was made a Holocaust or sacrifice, that he might abandon all enmity, and consummate a perfect peace betweene thee and God. Wherefore feare not thy finnes, but reioyce in thy Christ; and let thy soule be ioyfull within thee, say vnto thy soule as *Dauid* did, *Prayse the Lord, O my soule, and all that is within me, prayse his holy Name;* because hee hath of his tender compassion, on thee conferred the riches of his mercy, and incorporated thee into the mysticall body of his sonne Christ Iesus, by whose most holy sacrifice God is so appeased that I dare *runne boldly vnto the Throne of Grace,* and with confidence in his name assure my selfe of eternall life.

But vnto all wicked men, which liue without feare, and die without repentance, (albeit their outward profession be more glorious in shew, then was the profession of the most strict Pharisee, but doing good workes in hypocrisie and dissimulation) I

Act. 8, 21, 22, 23

will say concerning the benefit of Christs Sacrifice, as Peter sayd to Simon Magus touching the guilts of the Holy Ghost, *You haue neither part, nor lot in this matter;* (that is in the sacrifice of Christ,) *for your heartes are not right in the sight of God. Repent therefore of your wickednesse, and pray God, if perhaps the thoughts of your hearts may be forgiven you: for I perceive you are in the gall of bitternesse and band of iniquity.*

Oh you wicked and vngodly men, deceiue not your soules, feede not your selues with vaine hopes, and dreaming expectations of future happinesse, for vnto heauen can you not come, but by the sacrifice of Christ, and till you leaue your sinnes by repentance and reformation, and be changed from your miserable state of nature, to the comfortable state of grace, you can haue no part nor portion in Christs sacrifice; for that was onely offered for them that were elected before all time, and shall be called in time to the sauing knowledge of the Lord Iesus Christ.

Isay 55.7.

Wherefore if any man desire to come to heauen, and there to enioy the felicity of Gods glorious Kingdome, let him then by a true iustifying faith apply the sacrifice of Christ vnto himselfe. *Let the wicked forsake his wayes, and the vniuersall his thoughts; and let him returne vnto the Lord, and hee will haue mercy vpon him; and to our God for hee will abundantly pardon.*

Ese 4.

The last vse of this point is for confutation of that most blasphemous doctrine, and damnable heresie of the Church of Rome, concerning the sa-

crifice

sacrifice of the Masse established by Canons in the
 said Council of Trent, and is now taught, and belee-
 ved by all Papists. The words of which Canons are
 these, If any man shall say that in the Masse, there is not
 offered unto God a true and proper Propitiatory Sacrifice
 under the formes of bread and wine: or shall deny that
 by this sacrifice is effected, that those which come unto
 God with a true heart and upright conscience, do obtaine
 mercy, let him be accursed.

Concil. Trident.

The other Canon hath these words, If any man shall
 say, the sacrifice of the masse to bee onely a sacrifice of
 praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of
 the sacrifice of Christ upon the crosse, and not propitia-
 tory, or shall say that it is profitable onely for him that
 offereth it, and not both for the quicke and the dead, for
 their sinnes, punishments, and satisfactions, let him be
 accursed. This diuinitie and most hereticall doctrine
 hath beene already confuted by the Scriptures
 which are as the anvil, the touchstone
 of truth, the pillar of faith, a strong army against he-
 reticks, so shall it also appeare to bee vnknewne to
 the Fathers of the Primitiue Church, and gain-sayd
 by diuiners of their owne Writers.

Now if in this confutation wee shall somewhat
 more then ordinarily relye vpon the iudgements of
 Writers, it is to be borne with, in regard that it is
 the best course (seeing like owles they see the light of
 the scriptures) to deale with them, which so much stand
 vpon antiquity, by the allegation of antiquity, and
 the testimony of their owne men.
 And the rather shall I insist thereon, because it
 falls so patte in the way, that I must eather remooue
 it.

Heretici sunt
 lucifuge scrip-
 turarum. Tertu-
 lian. Hermog.

it, or leape ouer it; as also, because herein consisteth the most principall part of Diuine Service in the Church of Rome; and vnto them it is the badge and cognizance to distinguish betweene the good and euill Christian; and in going thereunto, or not going, a man workes his owne saluation or damnation; and also because it compriseth in it the doctrine or the practise of the most points of controuersie between them and vs.

The Methode which I shall follow in this ensuing confutation shall be this.

First, I shall shew that the pretended sacrifice of the Masse hath no foundation either in the Scriptures or practise of the Apostles, or was knowne to the Fathers of the first sixe hundred yeares after Christ.

Secondly, I shall shew how the Masse got entrance, increase, and continuance in the Church of Rome from the time of Gregorie the great, vntill these our dayes.

Thirdly, I shall answer vnto the Obiections of our Aduersaries.

Lastly, I shall lay downe arguments confuting them, and establishing the Doctrine now taught in the Church of England.

And for the first of these.

If this sacrifice of the Masse haue any ground in Scripture, the Papists will be sure to alleadge whatsoever may seeme to make for their purpose. Let us then lay in the ballance of the Sanctuary their wrested Scriptures, and see how they prooue themselves in hand.

First, they alleadge the words of our Saviour to the woman of Samaria: *The houre cometh that you shall not worship the father neither in this mountaine nor at Ierusalem, but the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth.* What prooue they from hence? to adore, say they, is to sacrifice; which sacrifice, say they, is the sacrifice of the Masse. But who can be so blind as not plainly to discern, that worship is meant all spirituall seruice, and that after the materiall sacrifices the spirituall sacrifices shall succede. And Saint Augustine vnderstands it of inward and spirituall prayer. *wouldest thou pray in a Temple? pray within thy selfe* (saith he) changing this outward and materiall Seruice to inward and spirituall. *Crysostome* expounds Christ to speake of the spirituall sacrifice of our selues, which the Apostle mentions, *1. 2. 1.* And *Caitane* their owne Cardinall thus expounds this place. *In spirit, that is to say, not in the mountaine, not at Ierusalem, not in any one certaine place, not with a temporall seruice, but with an inward and spirituall.* *Ferus* likewise one of their own, though not so corrupt as now they are, layes, *In spirit, in as much as they shall haue receiued the spirit of Adoption, crying in him, Abba, Father. in truth, in as much as they shall call upon him in his Sonne, who is Truth it selfe.* *Offering* (saith he afterwards) *no more any quicke and living creatures, but their owne bodies in sacrifice a holy oblation and offering.* Thus neither by the Fathers nor by some of their owne Writers expounding this Scripture, can it appeare that Christ speakes in this place concerning the sacrifice of the Masse.

Secondly, the falshood of *Iohannes Stephanus* Di-

Allegat. 1.
Ioh. 4. 23.

Answ.

Aug. tract. 14.
in Ioh.

In Iohan. Hom.
32.

Epistola
ad Romanos

De Ioh. 4.
De Ioh. 4.

Allegat. 2.
De ruihus Ec.
cl. cath. cap. 3.
n. 1. & 2.

stantus

I. Agilla
2. 4. 101

2. 101

1. 101

1. 101

1. 101

Allegat. 3.
Genebrard.

Acts 17. 2.
Rhem. annotat.
in locum.

2. 101
2. 101
2. 101

tantum is palpable when he saith, That it is perspicuum
by the testimonies of Christ himselfe, and of Paul the
Apostle, and of the ancient Fathers, that Christ institu-
ted the sacrifice of the Masse, and was the Author
thereof. Wherefore hauing recited the institution of
the Sacrament out of the 22. chapter of Luke, and the
first of the Corinth. the eleuenth, vpon these words
Doe this in remembrance of me; hee concludeth, that
by those words Christ gaue commandement to sacri-
fice; for to doe signifies to sacrifice according to that
of Virgill.

Quem faciam vitulam pro frugibus, &c.

Ans. I answer, *Facere* in the latine signifies some-
times to sacrifice; but it is onely a Poeticall phrase
seldom read, and neuer but when it is ioyned with
the thing to be sacrificed. And the grecke language
wherein the Euangelist Luke, and the Apostle Paul
writeth not the word *Pojcin* to sacrifice. Where-
fore Christ instituting there not a Sacrifice but a Sa-
crament enioyneth vs to doe the same that hee had
done, namely, to blesse the bread, to eate the bread,
to blesse the cup, to drinke of the cup, to distribute
them both, and to receiue them both.

Thirdly, a great Papist of late yeares, seeing him-
selfe thrust out of this place, flyeth to another, and
will needes prooue that the Apostles said Masse by
that place of the Acts. *Leitourgounton de auton ka-
nesteuonton*. As they ministred vnto the Lord and
fasted. This word *Leitourgounton* as they ministred,
will haue to signifie as they were saying Masse.

Ans. I answer, the word properly signifies,
doe ouer day, or to serue: and therefore is to be tran-
lated

flated as they were serving the Lord. I know in the
greeke Church the Lords Supper was called *leitour-*
gia, a liturgie or service, but that is *kat exochen*, be-
cause it is the clearest badge of our Christian professi-
on, and a special worke of Gods service. So the A-
postle calls the almes of the Saints *leitourgia*, a liter-
gy or service, in both which places the word is used
which they would have to signifie, to say Masse in the
place before alleadged. They may as well prooue that
the Angells said Masse: for the same *Epitheton* is attri-
buted to them; They are called *leitourgika pneumata*,
minist'ring spirits. It were strange to translate it *Mas-*

Rom. 15
2. Cor 9

Heb. 1. 14.

But what is the meaning of the former place, *Lei-*
ourgounton, As they were minist'ring. *Decumenius* tells
us, Truly the same that (*keruntonton*) they were preach-
ing. The Syriacke and the Arabian: As they were at
prayers. Their old translation as they were executing
their office and ministerie. And the Glosse addeth, in
good workes every man according to his order and de-
gree.

Decumenius in
locum.

Nicholas de Lyr, and *Caictan* two of their owne
men; the first sayes, As they served God every one ac-
cording to his degree, fasting to the end, that their spirits
might be so much the more rayfed and lifted up to bea-
venly and divine things.

Nich. Lyr
in locum.

The second sayes, He speaketh nothing of what kind
their minist'ring was, but in as much as hee had spoken
before of Prophets and teachers, he would insinuate vnto
us, that they served God in teaching and prophesying.
Among these and all ancient expositors there is not
one can be found that did ever dreame of finding the
Masse

Caictan in loc.

Masse in this place of Scripture. But let vs further grant that the word doth signifie that they were celebrating the holy Sacrament: yet what can they from thence collect to proue the sacrifice of the Masse? yea but, say they, *Leitourgein* signifies to sacrifice: no Nay, but properly to execute a publike charge either in spirituall or temporall affaires. Wherefore *Suidas* calls *Leitourgia*, *he demosia huperefia*, a publike of fice or charge; and so is called *quasi in leica ergazein*; to doe some publike worke for the people; or suppose wee should yeeld they were sacrificing, why not sacrificing the Gospell according to that place which formerly I haue quoted and expounded to bee nothing els, but by preaching the Gospell to make the sacrifice of Christ to be knowne to their hearers; and by the sword of the spirit the word of God to kill and slay mens sinnefull lusts, that so they may bee offered vnto God a pure and vnspotted sacrifice.

Allegat. 4.

Fourthly, they tell vs of the Masse of Saint *Bernard*, *S. Marke*, *S. Matthew*, *S. Andrew*, *S. Dennis*, *S. Clement*. These are nothing but forged fables: of which we may say as *Augustine* touching that false booke of the Acts of the Apostles, which the Manichaeis falsly pretended, that hereby the enemies of the Gospel endeavoured to weaken the strength of the scriptures, and to strengthen the arme of falsehood; and therefore I may say of them as of the falses of those writings, that these pretended writings of the Apostles, which under their names containe the seedes of many false doctrines, ought not onely to be forbidden in the Church, but quite banished and burned. Forged they are as appeares. First by this, that they abound so with errors which

which in the purer ages of the Church, were not hatched.

Secondly, in that none of them were euer mentioned by any of the Fathers that liued 500 yeares after Christ. Lastly, in that in the masse of St. James many sentences, yea whole clauses of *Pauls* Epistles are woven in and inserted, albeit St. James was beheaded before *Paul* wrote any Epistles.

Fiftly, they alledge for the maintenance of their blasphemous sacrifice, that Epistle which quite kills it, and hunteth it out of the world. *Wee haue an altar, whereof they haue no power to eate which serue in the Tabernacle.* Now say they, if they had an altar, then had they also a sacrifice, and if a Sacrifice, what, but that of the Masse?

Ans. I answer, let vs learne what this Altar is, and wee shall soone know what the sacrifice is. The scope and meaning of the Author is to prooue that as the beasts were burned without the campe which were offered for sinne offerings for the people, so Christ suffered without the gates, being made a sinne offering for his elect; and as the Priest that serued in the Tabernacle had no part of that sinne offering, so they that trusted in the ceremonies of the Iewitall Law, and thought to be made perfect by legall sacrifices; they had no part in Christ, and that because they did make frustrate the Crosse of Christ, which was the visible Altar, whereon hee was offered without the gate.

And thus, and no otherwise, hath their owne glosse vnderstood it, saying, *wee haue an altar that is the Crosse vppon which Christ was offered, of which*

Allegat. 5. 0

Hebr. 13. 10

Glossa.

Oecumenius in
locum.
Chrysostomus
Theodoret in
locum.
Thom. in locum.

Haymo in cap. 8.
Apocal.

such are not partakers, &c. According as it is written, if you be circumcised, Christ availeth you nothing, because such as doe observe things of the Law, pointed out by the service of the Tabernacle, have no part in the effectuall working of Christs passion; therefore let vs offer a spirituall sacrifice by Christ, which is our high Priest. This is their owne exposition, whereby they taught vs formerly to offer a spirituall sacrifice through Christ, but now they tell vs they offer Christ himselfe. And thus Oecumenius expoundes this place, as also Chrysostome, and Theodoret; but most plainly Thomas whose words are these: This is the Altar, or the Crosse of Christ, whereupon hee was offered for us, or else this is Christ himselfe, in whom and by whom wee offer up our prayers. So in the Revelation 8. 3. Mention is made of the same Altar, and of the Angell which was to offer vpon it incense with the prayers of all Saints, Haymo Arch-bishop of Halberstadt interprets this Angell to be Christ, the golden censer to be his pure and perfect humane nature; the Altar also is himselfe (sayth hee) For to the Angell is giuen incense, that he may offer it vpon the Altar; that is, (sayth hee) vpon himselfe, to God the Father, by whom the Saints do direct all their Prayers and workes to the Father; according to the Scripture. If any man sinne we haue an Advocate with the Father, Iesus Christ the righteous, and hee is the propitiation for our sinnes.

Thus we see plainly that Haymo acknowledged no mediators but the Sonne of God, no Altar but Iesus Christ. With what face can they produce this for the confirmation of the Masse, where there is

not.

not one word tending to that purpose.

Lastly, they alleadge moreouer out of the same epistle (which is indeede the bane of their sacrifice) *Every high Priest, or other Priest (say they) taken from among men, is established by men in things pertaining to God, that hee may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sinnes.* Therefore a Priest doth now offer the sacrifice of the Masse, for to satisfie for sinnes. But see here their false dealing, the Text is *Pas archiereus* *Every high Priest*, not euery sacrificer, nor euery Priest, and indeede the Author compared the Leviticall high Priest, with our high Priest Iesus Christ, in this that both of them had their calling and ordination from God, the one being appointed by ordinary election, the other extraordinarily, and immediately from God, as beeing his *only begotten Sonne.*

Allegat. 6.

Heb. 5. 1.

Now what iuggling is here among these Masse-mungers, to conclude from the high Priest to euery inferiour Priest, and from the high Priest of the Law, to an inferiour Priest of Rome. As though it were lawfull and expedient, for a Minister of the Gospell to doe as the Leviticall high Priest did. For that the place alleadged is to be vnderstood of the Priest of Aaron, both *Oecumenius*, *Aquinas*, and their owne *Glosse* confesse: Moreouer, as I haue shewed formerly, there is not one place in all the Scripture, to proue the name of Priests giuen to the Ministers of the new Testament, no otherwise then vnto all Christians that offer vp spirituall sacrifices to the Lord.

Oecumenius.
Aquinas.
Glosa.

Thus theyASSE and tumble the Scriptures to seeke in them some props to vphold their masse, and

yet

yet at length are faine to retorne a *non est inventa*, it cannot there be found. I but they haue hope to finde it in the Primitive Church. Let vs see what manner of seruice was vsed in the first age after Christ. Certainly the masse vsed at this day, was no part of the forme of seruice of God in the first Christian Church. Therefore (albeit it be a matter of much difficulty to fish and finde out the truth from the bottomlesse lake of lying deceitfulness, being couered with huge heapes of ceremonies and superstitions which crept into the Church by degrees, in the succeeding ages:) I shall as briefly, as I can let you see what seruice was first vsed in the Church of Christ.

*Iustinus Martyr
in Apolog. 2.*

And here let vs admit the testimony of *Iustine Martyr* who liued about the yeare 160. in his second Apology for the Christians, who speaks thus. On the day which is called Sunday, which is the Lords day, there is an assembling and comming together of all kind of people, dwelling either in the fields, or in the Cities into one place, and there are read the Acts or Records of the Apostles (*ta apomnemoneumata Apostolon*) and the writings of the Prophets, so long as time would suffer. Then when the Reader hath left off reading (he *Proestos*) he that is President, (that is to say, the Bishop or Pastor) deliuereth (*nouthesia kai proklesin dia logou*) an admonition, and exhortation, by way of discourse, to stirre them vp to follow and practise those good things. Afterwards we rise all as ones, and send our prayers vnto God. The Prayers being ended, the bread, the wine, and the water (*prosphereta*) are brought, and the Pastor deliuereth with all the power and might in him, prayers and thanksgiving; the People adde thereunto, their approving

pruning voyce, saying, Amen. Then followeth the distribution, which is to euery one present; and communicating (con eucharistethemion) of the things which were blessed by thanksgiving, and they send of the same unto them that are absent by the Deacons. In the end they which are of ability, and are moued therewithall, giue euery one according as it pleaseth him, and that which is gathered abideth with the Pastor, wherewithall he makes provision for the fatherlesse, widdowes, sicke persons, captiues, and needy strangers.

Thus Iustine who is one of the neereft writers vnto the Apostles time, makes no mention either of copes, vestments, Albes, certaine number of praier, holy water, masses, or Propitiatory sacrifice. Nor Tertullian who liued 50. yeares after him, in his Apology for the Christians, makes any mention of any such things. Nay, here some of their owne men, Gregory the great (who notwithstanding was a liberal Benefactor to the masse) confesseth that, The custome of the Apostles was to consecrate the host, onely by saying the Lords prayer. Platina sayth, These things at first were nakedly and simply done, and St. Peter added nothing to the consecration but the Lords Prayer. And Walafridus Strabo, about the yeare 850. a famous Abbot, as Trithemius reporteth, sayth thus: what wee doe at this day by a Ministry enlarged with prayers, songs, and consecrations, the Apostles and those that followed next after them, performed in most simple and single manner, being no other thing then that which our Lord had commanded by prayers, and remembering his passion. And therefore they did breake bread in houses as appeares, Acts 20. And our Elders

reports:

Tertul.in Apolo.
pro Christian.
Gregor. lib.7. de
Registr.ch.67.
Platina in vita
Xysti. 1.
Walaf. Strabo
cap.22. in lib.de
reb.ecclesiast.
Idem affirmat.
Grego. Archiepi.
Cesariens. lib.7.
Epist.63.

Berno Augiensis
de reb. ad Mis-
sam spe. Han.

cap. 1.

Durand. in rati-
onali.

Polid. Virgil. de
verum inventor.
l. 5. c. 11.

report vnto vs, that in former times Masses were no-
thing else, then that which is vsually done vpon the
day of preparation, otkerwise called the Friday be-
fore Easter, vpon which day there is no Masse sayd,
but onely the communicating of the Sacrament, after
the pronouncing of the Lords Prayer. And Berno
Augiensis to the same effect sayth, That in the birth
of the Church Masse was not said and celebrated, as at
this day. And Durandus, The masse in the Primitive
Church, was not such as is at this day; for it did proper-
ly consist of no more then these eight words. This
is my body, This is my blood, Afterwards the Apostles
added thereunto the Lords Prayer.

By which it appeares, that they call that the
Masse which the Apostle, calles the Supper of the
Lord, yet confessing it to bee much altered and
changed: Diuers other testimonies of antiquity I
could alleadge to prooue the administration of the
holy Supper to be celebrated with publike prayers,
singing of Psalmes of all the people, reading of
the Scriptures, and interpreting of the same: bles-
sing the Sacraments according to the Lords institu-
tion; and distributing the same in their sole and
whole nature to all the people and all this vnder the
name (not of the Masse, but) of *Cena Dominicus*,
the Lords assemble, *Supaxis*, *Supelensis*. *Cena Domi-
nica*, the Lords Supper, *Epulum Dominicum*, the Lords
Banquet, but these I pretermitt.

Now let vs a little examine the fathers, that wee
may see whether they haue maintained any Propiri-
atory sacrifice to be in the Lords Supper offered by
the Minister, or in that which the Papists call
the

the Masse by the Priest.

But this premonition is to be obserued that albeit the Fathers speak frequently of a sacrifice in the Lords Supper, yet we are not to vnderstand it otherwise then for an Eucharisticall sacrifice, or a sacrifice of thanksgiving which no man will deny: but the name of a Propitiatory sacrifice is not found in all their writings.

And first *Clemens Alexandrinus* who was Saint Pauls Disciple thus saith, *we sacrifice not vnto God, and that vpon good consideration: for he hath no neede of any thing; but doth giue all things vnto vs, and therefore we doe glorifie him, who was sacrificed for vs; in sacrificing and offering vp our selues.* *Clem. Alexand. l. 2. Pedagog. c. 2.*

Againe, God would be honoured, though hee haue no need of any thing, as therefore wee doe honour him with our prayers, and this is the best and most holy sacrifice, when we send them vp into his presence with intention.

Note we that if Saint Clement had knowne Christ to be really offered in the Sacrament, hee would not haue beene so sacrilegious as to preferre the prayers of the Church in goodnesse and holinesse, before Christ himselfe.

Iustin Martyr, who thought reuerently and holily of the Lords Supper, (and as you haue heard formerly) layeth downe a description of the administration thereof, and yet not a word of any Propitiatory sacrifice, but on the contrary hath these words. *I dare be bold to affirme, that there are no other sacrifices that are perfect and acceptable vnto God, then the supplications and thanksgiving of good people; and Christians* *Iustin. Martyr in dial. cum Tryph.*

have learned that they are to offer no other, &c. Which he confirms againe by the words following. *We sacrifice vnto God without ceasing the sacrifice of prayse, sincere prayer, and the sweet savour of good workes.*

Lactant. l. 6. 26.

Lactantius speaks plainly. Two things must be offered vnto God, Gifts and Sacrifices; and they must be offered without bodily substance; for the gifts, the integrity and uprightnesse of the soule, for the sacrifices, Prayses, and Hymnes. who so doth this, sacrificeth to God, so often as he doth a good worke, &c. And therefore upon the altar of God, which is great indeed, and placed in the heart of man, so that it cannot be defiled with blood, it behooveth vs to set patience, faith, innocencie, chastitie. There is no other holy service save that. Note that he knew nothing of this Propitiatory Sacrifice which they pretend.

Euseb. de demon lib. 1. c. 6 & 10.

Eusebius Casariensis answering the Infidells, sayth. *We sacrifice therefore and burne; what? sometimes the Memory of that great Sacrifice, celebrating the Mysteries which our God hath given vs, and rendering vnto him thanks for our saluation; as also offering vnto him religious Hymnes and Prayers. Again: Sometimes we consecrate our selues to him, and his High Priest the Sacrificer which is Christ; dedicating our selues, soules, and bodies to his word. Obserue, hee calls the Lords Supper the Memory of that great sacrifice, and the bread and wine he tearmes mysteries of our saluation; but not a word of any Propitiatory Sacrifice therein contained.*

Idem l. 3. c. 4 & lib. 4. cap. 3.

Council Nicen.

About this time in the yeare 328. was holden the famous generall Council of Nice where from all parts of Christendome were assembled 318. Bishops.

in

in which there is one Canon *Peri bagia trapezes*, of the holy table wherein are these words, we doe not rest our selves contented with the bread ministered vnto vs here below, but lifting vp the vnderstanding of our minds, we thinke by faith that the lambe of God taking away the finnes of the world lyeth in this table, [Athanasius vpon *con hieron thnomenon*], Slaine but not sacrificed by the Priests.

In which words appeare that they esteemed the outward element to bee but bread, and as appeares afterward to be insufficient to nourish the soule, and therefore faith fed spiritually on the lambe of God, whose property is to make things corporally absent, to bee spiritually present. Againe, it sayes Christ was slaine, but figuratiuely or by representation, but not sacrificed by the Priests.

For as *Athanasius*, who was present at the same Councill, saith, The Sacrifice of the Lord once offered, did accomplishe all things, and remaineth fast and sure throughout all times. Aaron had his successors, but the Lord (since transference & succession) without any change from one to another holdeth the Priesthood for ever. How then dare the Priests of Rome say, they are after the order of *Melchizedech*, seeing Christ singularly was of that order?

But what sayes *Basil*? there is but one Sacrifice, which is Christ; and the mortification of the Saints, which is become famous and renowned for their confessing of him. There is but one besprinkling and cleansing with water, which is the new birth; there is but one purgation for sinne, that is his blood shed for the saluation of the world. To what end (saith the Lord) serue so ma-

Athanasius, 3.
cont. *Arian*.

Athanasius, 3.
cont. *Arian*.

Basil in cap. 1.
Esai.

my sacrifices? he requireth but one, that is, that every man doe reconcile, and offer himselfe to God, before him appearing a living sacrifice by a reasonable serving of him, and offering to God a sacrifice of prayse. Againe. Now in the end and latter age of the world, one onely sacrifice is approoved, once offered an oblation for sinne: for the lambe of God hath taken away the sinnes of the world, offering himselfe an oblation, and sacrifice of a sweete smelling savour. So that it is not the Priests offering of Christ, but Christs offering of himselfe that can expiate any sinne.

Gregor. Nazian.
in Pasch.
Orat. 2.

Gregory Nazianzene saith, The chiefe and principal point of wisdom is a good and an honest life, purged and made cleane before God, even that God which is most pure, and requireth no other sacrifice at our hands, but this purenesse, which the Scripture commonly calleth a contrite and a broken heart, the sacrifice of praise, a new creature in Christ, &c.

Euseb. Emiffen.
de can. Dom.

Eusebius Emiffenus hath these words, Seeing our Lord was to convey up into heaven this his humane body which he hath taken upon him beyond the reach of our piercing sight; it was needfull that upon this day hee should consecrate for vs the sacrament of his body and blood, that so what had once beene offered up for the price of our redemption might be honoured in a mystery for ever, to the end, that as redemption hath his ordinary course for the salvation of men, without any wearisomenesse, so also the everlasting oblation and perpetuall sacrifice of this redemption might live, and continue fresh in our memory, and that this one true and perfect sacrifice that is to say Christ, might continually bee present in grace; which we must iudge of by faith, not by our ward.

outward appearance; by the inward affection, and not by the outward sight.

Obserue here he calleth it a sacrament and not a sacrifice; he opposeth the Remembrance of the oblation to the oblation it selfe; the powerfull course and continuance of redemption, to redemption it selfe once wrought; the presence of grace to the real presence, and the body of Christ lifted vp to heauen, to the Sacrament of the same remaining in the Supper.

See Saint *Augustine*, who allegorizing the parable of the Prodigall child thus writeth. He slew the fatte calfe when in the sacrament of the altar, he renewed the memory of his Passion in his mind. And againe the true flesh of our sacrifice, and the flesh of Christ was anciently promised by the sacrifices in the old law; but in the passion of Christ, and on the crosse it was given in truth; and at this day is celebrated in our sacrifice by the sacrament of Remembrance. Obserue in the first place, he calls it the Memory of his passion; and in the second he calls it the Sacrament of Remembrance; which he confirms in another place saying, The Hebrewes in the sacrifices of beasts, which they offered vnto God, did celebrate the Prophecie of the sacrifice to come, which Christ did offer; Christians now celebrate the Memory of that sacrifice already done, by a sacred oblation; and participation of the body of Christ.

Diners other places may be alleadged, whereby it plainly appeares, that they knew of no such Sacrifice, as the Romanists now dreame of; nor neuer mention the word Propitiatory. But because it would be too tedious to requite all their sayings, I haue not thought

*Aug. ad frat. in
erem. serm. 27.*

*Aug. cont. Fau³
Manich. lib. 20.
cap. 21.*

*Aug. sent. Fau³
lib. 20. cap. 18.*

*Aug. in ioh.
lib. 1. cap. 12.*

onely by remembrance: so Christ is not really offered in the sacrifice of the Masse, but by representation. And againe, Christ would that it should bee daily remembred in Myſtery which was once offered up for our price; and that the everlasting sacrifice should live in our godly memory, and be present alwayes in grace: for Christ ought not to be crucified againe, but it is a sufficient remedy, if by faith and imitation wee keepe his death in remembrance.

Idem serm. de
can. dom.

Secondly, Peter Lombard upon this question, whether that which the Priest hath in his hand when hee is offering at the altar be properly a sacrifice? or whether Christ be offered every day?

Petr. Lomb. l. 4.
Sent. dist. 12.

Answers, That which is consecrated and offered by the Priest, to be called a sacrifice and an oblation: because it is a recordation, and representation of that true sacrifice and holy immolation made upon the crosse. And that Christ dyed but once upon the crosse, and was offered onely there in himselfe, but yet he is offered daily in the sacrament, because in the sacrament there is a remembrance of that which was done.

Thirdly, let vs take his Catholike brother with him Thomas Aquinas, that Angelicall Doctor, as hee is styled, shewing how Christ is sacrificed in the Masse, faith; The celebration of the Sacrament is called a sacrifice for two reasons.

Aquin. 2. part.
q. 83. art. 1.

1. The administration of the Sacrament is an image representing the passion of Christ, which is his true immolation; and images use to be called by the names of those things whereof they are images.

2. In respect of the effects of his passion, because by the sacrament wee are made partakers of the fruit of Christ.

Christs sacrifice, And (saith he) according to this second manner, it is proper to this sacrament that Christ is immolated or sacrificed therein. Thus these great and learned Doctors, pillars I may call them of the Church of Rome confesse the same with vs, that Christ is not really, properly, and truly sacrificed in the Eucharist, but Metonymically; because therein is a representation of the death of Christ, and a commemoration of his passion; and an application to euery particular beleuer of the benefits of Christs redemption vnto himselfe by faith.

And here we are to take notice of the reason, why the Fathers learned the *Sacrament* by the name of a *Sacrifice*; and why they called it an *unbloody Sacrifice*.

Seeing the whole outward seruice both of the Iewes and Gentiles consisted principally in sacrifices, it seemed hard and harsh to those that were conuerted either from the one side or other, and like to giue much offence, if the Church should wholly abolish all sacrifices; because these Prosolites newly conuerted to Christianity did not beleene that religion could subsist without sacrifices. Least therefore they might exasperate or prouoke either the one or the other, the Christians applyed themselves both to heare and speake of altars and sacrifices; and for that the Apostles had taught them that all externall sacrifices had their end in Christ, they therefore durst not giue any approbation to the continuance of Iewish sacrifices, much lesse to Heathenish; therefore they called the *Lords Supper*, their prayers, their seruice, their almes, and well-nigh euery religious acti-

ons a Sacrifice, the Table of the Lord, an Altar, the Bishops, and Pastors, Priests. And thus the Fathers called the Supper of the Lord, the true Sacrifice of Christ, because of the truth of *representation*, and truth of the *effect* thereof to the faithfull, because also that the Church doth therein truly offer her selfe to God, as *August. de ciuit. Dei. lib. 10. cap. 20.*

August. de ciuit. Dei. lib. 10. c. 20.

Thus the Lords Table was called by the Fathers an *Altar*, not properly, but by a signe and allusion; and hereupon sometimes it is called an Altar, sometimes a Table. *The Table of thy spouse hath holy bread and an holy Cup.* And *Augustine*, None say so but such as receiue life from the Lords Table. Againe he calls it an Altar (*Ad Bonifa. Epist. 90.*) saying *They rushed in upon him with horrible violence, and furious cruelty with clubs, and such like weapons, as he stood at the Altar, breaking downe the wood of the Altar most barbarously.* And some of the Fathers deny that they haue any Altar properly; which doubtlesse they would neuer haue done, had they acknowledged a Propitiatory sacrifice in the Sacrament. *Our Altar is an earthly gathering together of such as do apply themselves to prayers.*

Auth. libr. de cultur. agr. Dom. in Augusta

August. cont. lit. Petil. lib. 2. c. 47

Arnobius sayth, *The heathen did accuse the Christians, because they did not build them Altars.* About the 400. yeare Altars began, not for sacrifice, but for the honour and memory of the Martyrs; as the Councill of *Carthage* doth record, *cap. 11.*

Clem. Alexan. Strom. 7. Arnob. lib. 6. cont. gentes.

Concil. 5. Carth.

Now how do the Fathers call it an *unbloody sacrifice*. In two respects, first thereby to distinguish betweene this representatiue Sacrifice of the Sacrament, and the bloody sacrifices of the law, and the
L bloody

Zanch. de cultu.
Dei externo.

bloody Sacrifice offered by Christ himselfe vpon the Crosse; by which very distinction it appears that the Fathers dreamed not of *Transubstantiation* nor the presence of any humane or materiall blood, in the Sacrament, for then doubtlesse they would neuer haue vsed that distinction. And me thinkes that distinction being admitted by the Church of Rome, euertes and ouerturneth the reality of a *Propitiatory Sacrifice*: For Christ cannot be sacrificed except hee be slaine, and he cannot be slaine without shedding of blood, and if his blood be shed really vpon the Table after a corporall manner, then how is it an *vnbloody Sacrifice*: wherefore it is first called an *vnbloody Sacrifice* to distinguish betweene the bloody sacrifices of the Iewes, and of Christ himselfe; it being not a refacricing of Christ, but onely a figuratiue representation and a mysticall commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ.

In tom. 3. ex lib.
de fide ad Petr.
Diac cap. 19.

Secondly, it was called an *vnbloody Sacrifice*, because it was *Eucharisticall* and a sacrifice of prayse and thankesgiuing, as for all blessings in generall, so especially for the worke of our redemption by Christ. And this is manifested by a notable saying of Saint *Augustine*, *Hold it firmly, and doubt not that the only begotten Sonne of God, which was made flesh for vs, offered himselfe for vs a sacrifice of a sweet smelling sauour vnto God, to whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost, in the time of the ancient Law, liuing sacrifices were offered; and to whom now with the Father and the holy Ghost, one onely God, the holy Church doth not cease to offer bread and wine throughout the whole world. For in those carnall sacrifices there is a figuring.*

figuring of the flesh of Christ, which hee was to offer for our sinnes, and of the blood which he was to shed for the remission of sinnes: but in this sacrifice there is a commemoration and thanksgiuing for the flesh of Christ which he hath offered, and of the blood which he poured out for vs. Obserue here, first he calleth it bread and wine which is offered: Secondly, hee shewes the end, only for commemoration and thanksgiuing.

So that none of the Fathers did tearme the *Eucharist* or Sacrament of the Lords Supper, in that fence which the Papists doe, to bee an *vnbloody sacrifice*; because Christ without shedding of blood was really, properly, and personally offered; but because it was both a representation of that substantiall and great sacrifice which Christ offered on the Crosse, as also because it was a sacrifice of prayse, thanksgiuing, and commemoration.

And heereupon some of the learned Papists as *Gropperus* and others being ashamed of this grosse and impious opinion of the Romanists, haue confessed the Masse to be nothing but, *Onely a remembrance of the passion of Christ, in a publicke congregation of Christians, where there is a generall thanksgiuing for the benefit of our redemption; but that sacrifice of Christ upon the Crosse, to bee offered to God, and to remaine in the presence of God in the time of the Supper, that when a man despaire of his owne worth, hee may apprehend the price of our redemption (to wit) the body of Christ by faith, and offer it to God, betweene the wrath of God and his sinnes, for the obtaining of that pardon which Christ hath both merited and procured.*

Thus haue wee at length, brought this first part of our confutation to an end, in which is plainly prooued, that the Popish Sacrifice of the Masse, hath no foundation either in the Scriptures, or Apostolicall constitutions; or was either knowne vnto, or named by the Fathers for the space of 600. yeares after Christ; as also that the Fathers vsed the word *Sacrifice* in a farre different sence from that of the Church of *Rome*.

The second
generall part.

*Ambro. lib. 5.
Epist. 33.*

*Azorius Iesuit
institut. moral.
part 3. lib. 10.
cap. 18.
As also Masso-
nius lib. 2. de
Episc. Rom. titul
Leo primus.*

The second part followes wherein wee shall demonstrate how, and by what degrees the Masse was brought into the Church, and how it increased; and first shall I shew the meaning of the word Masse, and how it was vsed in the Ancient Church. The Papists themselves are not certaine of the antiquity of the word *Missa*, the Masse; yet they finde it no ancients then Pope *Leo*, and Saint *Ambrose* his time; so their owne Iesuites confesse, *Bellarmino* and others. But the word *Missa* when it is vsed by the Fathers, signifies nothing but a publike meeting to the Communion, and prayers; or a dismissal of the assembly, or the forme of their religious worship: For the first of these it signifies an assembly gathered together, to serue God publikely (as *Georg. Cassan. prafat. in preces suas*, confesseth) which the Greekes signified by the word *sunagein*, to meete together, *sunaxeis poiein*, to make congregations; *ekklefiazein* to gather together, which words they for the establisshing of their hereticall doctrine, haue absurdly translated, *to make Masse, or to goe to Masse*.

Secondly, the word Masse was vsed for the forme of religious seruice vsed by, and in the Church, and signified

signified the same with *leiturgia* or *hierourgia*. The *Meleuitan Counsell* taketh prayers and Masses both for one thing; and to this purpose Saint *Augustine* in a Sermon (if it be his) sayth, *There are some, and chiefly great men in the world, when they come vnto the Church, are not deuoutly affected to celebrate the Prayes of God, Sed cogunt presbiterum vt abreniet Missam; but compell the Minister to make short the Masse.*

Heere the word Masse signifieth the whole Liturgie, reading of Scriptures, singing of Psalmes, Prayers and Prayings of God.

Thirdly, it signified the dismissal of some of the congregation; as wee shall shew immediately. The Papists deriue it diuersly, some a *missione*. *Quia oblatio & preces ad Deum mittantur*; because an oblation and prayers are sent vp to God, or *Quia Angelus a Deo mittatur, qui sacrificio assistat*, because an Angell is sent from God to assist the Sacrifice. Some of the word *Missath* vsed (*Deutr. 16. 10.*) or *Masah* which signified a *free gift, or Eleuation*, but certainly there are no words now vsed in the Church of the Latines, or which were vsed formerly deriued of the Hebrewes, but they were first vsed by the Greeke Church and Fathers: but this word *Missa* or *Mis-sath* was neuer vsed by any of the Fathers of the Greeke Church to signifie, either the assembling or seruice, or Sacrifice of the Church.

And therefore is rather to be thought to be deriued a *missione*, and that two wayes; either a *donis missis*, from the gifts that were sent by such as were of ability, at the celebration of the Sacrament, both

Council. Meleu-
1. an. c. 12.
Aug. Serm. de
Temp. 251.

Hug. de Sanct.
victor.

Thom. Aquin. 3.
part. quest. 83.
art. 4.

Genebrard. de
litourg. sancti.
Dionys.

Salmaron Iesuit
epist. ad Canifi-
um de nomine
Misse.

Azor. Iesuit. In-
stitut. moral. par
3. l. 10. c. 18.

Binius Tom. 3.
concion. p. 110.

Raban. Manus
Institut l. 1. c. 31
Innocen. de sacr.
Altaris myster.
l. 6. cap. 12.

Beatus Rhenanus
in lib. quar. Tert.
aduer. Marcion.

Rabbi Levi in c.
5. Leuit.

Procul hinc, pro-
cul este Propha-
ni.

Sic refert Festus
Appulei lib. 2. de
aureo asino.

Alexander ab
Alexandro l. 4.
c. 17.

for the furnishing of the Lords Table, as also for the reliefe of the poore. Or else it was called *Missa*, a *dimissione populi* (as Cyprian calls, *remissam peccatorum*, for *remissionem*) when the Deacon cries, *Ita missa est*: *Leaue is granted, you may depart*. And it is not vnlikely, that the same custome was vsed by the Greeke Church, when the Minister cried, *Aphe sis laois*; *dismission to the people*.

This dismissal was two-fold.

The first was called *Missa Catechumenorum* when the *Catechumens* (that is) such as beeing conuerted to Christianity, but not sufficiently instructed in the principles of religion, and therefore were not as yet baptized, were caused to depart; as also with them the *Penitents* who for some open and scandalous crime did do publike penance in the congregation; and the *Energumenes* (that is,) such as were excommunicate (who were so called, because being deliuered vp vnto Sathan, they were supposed to be vexed with wicked spirits) These three sorts of people were permitted to bee present both at the prayers, seruice, and Sermon; but when the Lords Supper began to be administred, they were to depart; wherefore the Deacon cryed with a loud voyce, *Ita missa est* *Leaue is giuen, you must depart*. A custome not vnlike that of the Iewes, which was, not to permit any Leprouse or infected person to be present at their sacrifices; and the custome of the Heathens, who would haue present at their sacrifices and augurations, neither enemy, nor conquered, nor woman, nor virgin, nor any profane person; wherefore the Priest was wont to aske *Ti stede? who is there?* and the
answere

answere was returned, *Kaloi k'agathoi*; none but such as are good and honest.

The second, was *Missa Fidelium*, the Masse of the Faithfull, which was the whole ceremony and celebration of the Lords Supper: Then all things being finished, they had liberty to depart.

Thus it appeares that the word Masse is not so ancient as our aduersaries pleade, *Ierome* who was the Pastor of *Rome*, and of no small credit with them, neuer vses the words; *Ambrose* once onely; *Augustine* but twise, and neither of these in that sence in which the Papists vse it. And whereas they obiekt that place of *Ierome* one the 11. chapter of the *Proverbes*, it is not thought to be his, because therein is mentioned *Gregory*, who liued about 200. yeares after *Ierome*; but the best learned do ascribe it to *Bede*, as they do the Sermon of Saint *Augustine* *de tempore*, to *Ambrose* or *Hugo de Sancto Victore*.

But from the name, let vs proceede to the thing it selfe.

Albeit, that about the time of Saint *Gregory*, there hapned such an alteration of the Canon of the Masse, of the manner of seruice, of vestiments; of the bread; of priuate Masses; of prayers vnto Saints; and so continued till *Charles* the great, insomuch that the Church of *Rome* had cast off her ancient simplicity, and Matron-like habit, and became like a garish Curtezan, yet this sacrifice of the Masse was not as yet allowed of generally in the Church. Not in *Gregories* time, for *Bellarmino* himselfe confesseth he could finde nothing in his writings for confirmation of this their sacrifice. For the corporall reality of

Greg. tom. 1.
Moral. l. 14. c. 31.

Luke 24. 39.

A Sermon Saxon.
on legend in Fest
Paschatis to be
seene in the
Library at Ox-
ford, and other
Cathedrall
Churches.

of this sacrifice, which our aduersaries defend vpon an imagination of a Transubstantiation of the bread into the body of Christ, seemes to be sufficiently confuted by that disputation held by *Gregory* against *Eutiches* the Hereticke, who denied that *Christ* had a true humane body, against whom *Gregory* objected that saying of our Sauour to his Disciples, who after his resurrection made a doubt of that which *Eutiches* spared not to maintaine, namely, that it was not the same body wherein he was crucified but onely a shadow of a body, and so his humanity was but *kata Phantasian*, not really, but onely in appearance; But *Gregory* objects the words of Christ. *Handle me, and see for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me haue; behold my hands and feete, that it is I my selfe.*

By the same testimony of sence, may Christians now discern bread to be bread after consecration, by which the Disciples discern Christs flesh to be flesh after resurrection; they were to beleue because they did see and feele it to be the flesh of Christ, wee haue the benefit of foure senses, seeing, handling, tasting, smelling, to prooue vs to receiue not flesh, but bread.

And here we may note what was the faith of the Church of *England* about those times of *St. Gregory*, by an ancient Homily written in the Saxon tongue, and appointed to be preached throughout *England* in euery Church vpon *Easter* day.

Part whereof runnes thus.

In the holy font we see two things in that one creature; after the true nature, the water is corruptible wa-

ter, and yet after Spirituall mystery it hath hallowing
 might. So also wee behold the holy housell, it is bread,
 after bodily understanding, then wee see it is a body
 corruptible, and mutable; but if wee acknowledge
 therein a spirituall might, then understand wee that
 life is therein, and it giueth immortality to them that
 eare it with beleife. Much difference there is betweene
 the inuisible might of the holy housell, and the visibler
 shape of the proper nature. It is naturally corruptible
 bread and corruptible wine; and it is by the might of
 Christs word, truly Christs body and his blood, not so
 notwithstanding bodily, but spiritually, much diffe-
 rence is there betweene the body that Christ suffered in;
 and the body that is hallowed to housell; the body that
 Christ suffered in, was borne of the flesh of Mary with
 blood, and with bone, with skinn, with sinewes in
 humane limmes, with a reasonable soule lining; and
 his spiritnall body, which we call the housell, is gathe-
 red of many cornes without blood and bone, without
 limme, without soule, and therefore nothing therein is
 to be understood bodily; but all is spiritually to be un-
 derstood. By these words plainly appeares that the
 ancient Christians in England held not that grosse
 transubstantiation maintained now by the Romish
 Church, which is the mother of the Massing sacri-
 fice, for take away transubstantiation and of necessity
 you lay the honour of their sacrifice in the dust.

For the space of 500. yeares after Gregory, this Sa-
 crifice of the Masse beganne to gather strength, and
 to be taught, and maintained, though not gene-
 rally in the Church of Rome.

Pascasius Abbot of Corby in Saxony hath these
 words

Pasca. de Corp.
 & Sang. Dom.
 ap. 9. & 10.

words. Because we sinne daily, Christ is Sacrificed for vs. Mystically, and his Passion giuen in Mystery. Againe, The blood is drunken in Mystery spiritually, and it is all spirituall which wee eat. And, The full similitude is outwardly, and the flesh of the immaculate Lambe is faith inwardly; that the truth be not wanting to the Sacrament, and it be not ridiculous to Pagans, that wee drinke the blood of a slaine man. Note here, that he would haue the outward signe, and the inward substance represented by the signe, to subsist in the Sacrament, otherwise it takes away the truth of the Sacrament; and hee would not haue the Pagans thinke, the Christians to be so absurd, as to drinke the reall and substantiall blood of Christ with their bodily mouthes, but onely Sacramentally, and in a Myltery.

Bertram de Corp
et Sang. Dom.

Bertram Presbiter, liued about the 900. yeare of Christ, in the time of Charles the Bald, whose wordes agree directly with the Doctrine of the Church of England, and are these. Our Lord hath done this at once, euen in offering himselfe (that is to say, sacrificing himselfe for vs :) For hee was once offered for the sinnes of the people; and this oblation notwithstanding is dayly celebrated by the faithfull, but in a mysterie: to the end that what hath beene accomplished by our Lord Iesus in offering himselfe once, might be handled eue-ry day, by the celebrating of the Mysteries, of the renewing of the memory of his passion. Where is to be noted how he opposeth the mysticall receiuing, to the reall receiuing, and the dayly renewing of the remembrance, to the once offering of the sacrifice. Againe, He hath (saith he) left vs an example which is daily

dayly offered by the faithfull, in the mysterie of his body and his blood, namely, that whosoever will draw neere vnto him, may know that he must haue part in his sufferings; the image and representation whereof is exhibited in the holy Mysteries.

About the 1000. yeare liued * Theophilact who seems to deny this Propitiatory Sacrifice; in these words, The medicines which are effectuall and forcible do heale at the first time, being administr'd, but those which neede to be taken againe and againe, doe sufficiently argue their weaknesse by that onely note: euen so it farrth betwene the Legall Sacrifices, and the Sacrifice of Christ. But here ariseth a question, whether we also doe offer sacrifices without shedding of blood: vnto which we answere affirmatiuely, but it is that we doe renew the Memory of the death of the Lord; and yet in the meane time it is but one Sacrifice not many, because it hath beene offered but onely once: we offer then dayly himselfe, or rather the Remembrance of this oblation, by which he did offer himselfe. And in another place he hath these words, where there is remission of sins, there needes not any more sacrifices: but Christ hath offered a Sacrifice seruing and standing sufficient for euer; and therefore wee haue no neede of any other second sacrifice.

About the 1000 yeare they beganne to ordaine Priests, with these words, *Accipe potestatem missas celebrandi, & sacrificium offerendi pro viuis & mortuis.* Take power to celebrate Masses, and to offer Sacrifice for the quicke and the dead. Then had priuate Masse gotten some life, wherein the Priest alone did communicate for himselfe, and for those

Theophil. in c. 8
Ioan.

* Neither doth it appeare by the writings of Bede, of Maymo in cap. 5. Osen. & c. 2. Habbar. & c. 1. Malac. of Remigius in Psal. 51. of Raban de Instic. Cleric. l. 1. c. 32. Of Anselm. in c. 10. epist. ad Heb. All which liued betwene the time of Gregory the Great and the Lateran Councill, Adde vnto these Berengarius Deane of St. Maurice in Angiers the wonder of histime for all learning: He liued betwene the 1100. and 1200 yeares or about the 1051. according to Sigbert, Luthericus an Arch-bishop

in France, denied the reall presence as Barminus reports, An. 1004. num. 5.

Adde vnto the former Almaricus, a Doctor of Paris, burnt for this opinion about the yeare 1190.

of whom Bernardus Lutgenburg, and Gaguinus, a French Historian make mention.

These latter directly withstood transubstantiation before the Lateran Council.

Them succeeded the Albigenses & the Waldenses about the yeare 1210.

Arnoldus de Villa nova refuted Transubstantiation about the yeare 1240.

as Hesland reports. Cent. 13. Lib. 2. Cap. 11.

q. d. d. d. d. d.

those who had payed him a good price to be remembered when hee receiued the Sacrament, that intentionally the vertue of his communicating might profit them to saluation. Then began the circumgestation; or carrying about of the host with the adoration or worshipping of it. Then began they to ascribe to it the power of healing, and working of miracles.

And about this time did the Church of Rome giue vnto the Sacrament that great and as yet vnrecovered name of taking away the cup of the Lords Supper from the Layity, that is, like Arithmeticians they had liberally studied addition, making many things essentiall to the Sacrament of the Supper, which were not; so now they might put in practise Subtraction by with-holding the one halfe of the Elements (wherwith Christ institutes and the Apostles and Primitive Church celebrated the Lords Supper) from the lay people.

Let euery man iudge here whose religion is new, or who are the Innovators, they or we.

Among diuers other additions vnto the ceremonies of the Masse, in the yeare 1065. was ioyned the blessing of the incense wherein there is mention made of a propitiatory sacrifice. But this doctrine was not generally established in the Church till within this 408 yeares; for as one of their greatest Schoolmen affirms, *Ante Concilium Lateranense hoc dogma non fuit*. Before the Council of Lateran this opinion, namely of transubstantiation was not, that is, generally approued and maintained.

And Cornelius Musso a Bishop of Bituntum (so famous

famous for his learning, as *Sixtus Senensis* writeth, that he was a Preacher at twelve yeares old, and all Italy named after him) did defend in the Councell of Trent; that *Christ at his last Supper did offer no sacrifice at all*; meaning no true Propitiatory sacrifice. For (as he saith) if he offered himselfe to his Father in his last Supper, then should he not haue perfected his sacrifice with one oblation made, as *Saint Paul* teacheth, but with a double oblation twice made, once in the Supper and once vpon the crosse, which were most repugnant to the holy Scripture.

But from the time of the Laterane Councill, this doctrine of the Masseooke such roote, and spread itselfe forwarde and so fast, that the greatest part of Europe is darkned with the darke shade thereof; growing by degrees from an action of thanksgiving to an Eucharisticall Sacrifice, and from thence to a Propitiatory sacrifice by way of Mystery and Commendation; and from thence to a true, proper, and real Propitiatory sacrifice, equall with, nay farre more effectual then the sacrifice that Christ himselfe offered vpon the crosse. And this dangerous and blasphemous doctrine crept in the more easily by the ignorance of these latter ages both in the Church and Commonwealth, caused by the troubles of the Church of Rome, as also by the corruption of languages which was in this last thousand yeares, occasioned by the mixture of diuers nations together in seuerall kingdoms, and especially Italy; and this heresie being crept into the Church was fostered and nourished by the coldnesse of mens deuotion, the couetousnesse of the Priests, and the carelesnesse of the Bishops. The cold-

*Shar. tom. 2.
d 74. sect. 2.
pag. 9. 49.
Heb. 7. 27. &
26. 28.*

*Ad. 2. M. 10. 10. 10.
28. 8. 1. 1. 1. 1.
1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.*

*22. 01. 5A
21. 21. 5A*

coldnesse of mens deuotion was such, that whereas in the feruent zeale of the Christian Church, the Supper of the Lord was celebrated euery Lords day, yea in some Churches euery day, and great multitudes resorted and thronged thereunto, yet in proceffe of time, men began so to neglect the Lords Table, that there was this law enacted to compel them to a more carefull respect of communicating, That such lay people as did not communicate at the least euery feast of the Natiuitie, Easter and Whitsontide should be held for Infidells.

Carol. Mag. lib.
1. cap. 138. 182.
167.

This law was afterward ratified by Charles the Great; and vrged vpon the people.

But hereby it came to passe that the profits of the Priests were much curtailed, because the people brought not so many offerings as in former times; wherefore the Clergie thought to vsee speedy remedie for this discaie, and therefore began to teach them, that the Sacrament was not onely profitable for the saluation of the Communicants, but also for all their friends, and kindred liuing and dead, which the Priest should remember secretly with himself at the time of celebration; and this they called *vim Masse*, the force & efficacy of the Masse. This brought in store of gaine to the Priests purse, as *Diana* did to *Demetrius* and his companions; and as the *Pythonsse* did vnto her masters; no maruaile then if they stand to maintaine that which maintaines them.

Act. 10. 25.

Act. 16. 16.

This doctrine of the Massing sacrifice they cunningly built vpon two foundations, which were layd both at this time, the better to keepe the people in awe, and to cause the more respect vnto their sacrifice.

The

The first was *Transubstantion*; for after it was taught that the bread and wine was changed substantially into the body and blood of Christ, then what reuerence was too great for this sacrifice? who could doubt that it was Propitiatory?

The second was Purgatory; for then (might the people argue) if our friends departed out of this world doe abide the scorching flames of Purgatory; and that wee our selues must thither too; and if the holy sacrifice of the Masse hath such vertue as to ease the soules therein; then let vs out of charitie to our friends pay some portion of money to the Priest, for the cessation of their paines; and out of loue to our selues when we dye, let vs leaue grounds and goods to the Church that Masse may be sayd for vs when we are dead. Thus you see how the sacrifice of the Masse got footing: vpon what ground it stood, and so continues.

But God that still prouideth for his Church, will, and hath caused light to breake out of darknes, that albeit the darknes of Egypt bee palpable, yet light shall shine clearely in *Gosben*; and to this end hath sent diuers of his seruants to deliuer truth out of prison, and to manifest the light thereof vnto his people.

Their owne tongues are against them; and some of their owne brood hatched about the time of the Laterane Councell, disclaime this point. As you haue heard *Aquinas* speaking in this case, pag. 71. so heare whether he be not still the same, who sayes, *It behooueth that there euermore should remaine some representation of the passion of our Lord. In the old se-*

*Aquin. in Sum.
part. 13. q. 73.
art. 6.*

ament.

flament this principall sacrament was the Paschall lambe; whereupon the Apostle sayes, Christ our Paschall Lambe was offered. And in place thereof hath succeeded the Eucharist in the new Testament, which is a Memorall of his passion past and suffered, as the other was a prefigurer and foreshewer of his passion to come.

Petr. Alph. l. 2.
ep:

In dialog. tit. 12.

Petrus Alphonsus at the same time did acknowledge the Masse or Eucharist for no other thing then a Sacrifice of praise. And this was at that time one of the questions disputed by the Albigenes and Petrus Brutis, who was burnt at Tholosa where hee taught publikely that it was not a Propitiatory. All these sacrifices (saith he) which were used under the law, were nothing but signes of this great sacrifice, which was to destroy sinne, But since the coming of Christ wee use not any other sacrifice but that of bread and wine which he hath ordained, & is like vnto that which Moses in the law called *קרבן* and sacrifice of prayse; for therein we prayse God for the benefit hee hath bestowed vpon vs, saving vs by his onely Sonne, &c.

Alex. Hales.

Alexander Hales seemes to crosse the Masse in diuers of his assertions: for he speakes thus, Iesus Christ hath offered a double sacrifice, a spirituall and corporall, the spirituall that is a sacrifice of deuotion, and loue towards mankind, which he hath offered in spirit; the corporall, the sacrifice of the death which he underwent vpon the crosse, which is represented in the sacrament. (Marke he confesseth no realitie of a sacrifice, any otherwise then by representation). The spirituall figured by the incense and perfume which was made vpon the inner altar; the corporall which hee offered in his flesh, two wayes, that is to say, sensibly vpon the crosse,

and

and insensibly vpon the altar. (Obscure he tearmes it an insensible offering; not grosse vnder the formes of bread and wine.) That sensible sort being shadowed out by the sacrifices of beasts; but the insensible by the sacrificing of things that are insensible, as fruits, bread, and wine, both the one, and the other vpon the vnter altar.

Here he maketh one Propitiatory, for such were the sacrifices wherein beasts were offered with the shedding of their blood for sinne; figuring out the singular sacrifice vpon the crosse offered by the Messiah the Lord Iesus Christ. The other Eucharisticall onely, for such properly were those of fruites, bread, &c.

Lyra also that Catholike interpreter of the whole scripture seems not much to dissent from the former; for writing of the Sacrifice of Christ that it is not to be iterated, preoccupates an objection thus. You will say the sacrament of the altar is euery day offered vp in the Church. But the answer hereto is, that this is no reiterating of the sacrifice, but an ordinary remembering and calling to mind of the onely Sacrifice offered vpon the crosse, wherefore it is said, Math. 26. Doe this in remembrance of me.

Nic. Lyran. in
epi. ad Heb. c. 10.

That most learned Arrius Montanus, vpon Luk. 22. thus writes, This is my body: that is, My body is sacramentally contained in this sacrament of bread: and straight way he addes (like another Nicodemus Christs nightly disciple) The secret and most mysticall manner whereof, God will once vouchsafe more clearly to unfold vnto his Church.

Arrius Mont.
in Luk. 22.

Thus hath the light of truth appeared from the

N

begin-

beginning of the Primitive Church vntill these our dayes, albeit (till within this hundred and odde yeares) it hath from the time of Gregory shined more diminely, and since the Laterane Councell seemed well nigh to be quite extinct,

But at last the Sunne of righteousness communicated his light vnto these starres, which haue illuminated our Horizon, such as *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Oecolampadius*, *Caluine*, *Beza*, *Jewell*, and many famous Martyrs in queene *Maryes* dayes as *Crauer*, *Latimer*, *Ridley*, *Bradford*, *Philpot*, &c. which (albeit it pleaseth the Romish Factors to brand them with the title of Heretickes) haue so dispelled the darkenesse of superstition, and discovered the Myserie of Antichrist, that all the world may point out which is the purple and scarlet Whore, *Babylon the great*, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, whose shame, her children, louers and friends would faine conceale, but God hath layd it open, and will dayly more and more, before men and angells, till the time come, when she shall be cast downe, burnt with fire, and made desolate for euermore.

Reu. 17. 5.

Thus haue I let you see briefly (and I doubt more briefly then so ample a matter doth require) how the sacrifice of the Masse crept into the Church, and how it hath continued.

How first it was celebrated in a most plaine and simple manner.

Secondly, it began to admit some encrease of ceremonies, especially the offerings for the dead, which was but a gratulation and thanksgiving for them, vntill 200. yeares after Christ.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, *prayers for the dead*, got entrance into the Supper about 400. yeares; then came in *Purgatory* and redemption of soules thence by Masses, though not generally taught nor authorized by any Councill.

About the 780. yeare *Gregoryes Masse* was publike-ly taken vp in the Churches of Italy, whereas before *Ambrose his Masse* was of more generall vse.

Fourthly, the disputations of *Transubstantiation* began about the yeare 840., but were not fully concluded till the *Councell of Lateran* by *Innocent* the third, anno 1216. After which came in the offering of the body and blood of Christ vpon the altar. And after that, there followed the enelosing carrying about and adoration of them. Thus grew the Church of Rome from euill to worse, till it came to that miserable state wherein it now is.

And as the Romanists are Innouatours in respect of the Sacrifice of the Masse, so are they also in respect both of the Canon & of the Ceremonies of the Masse: for whereas they boast that the forme of the Masse in respect of the Canon is so ancient, as that they deduce it from the Apostles, and to this end alledge the *Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie of Dionysius*, some of their owne writers doe question the veritie and antiquity of that book, doubting whether it be spurious or no; and that the Canon hath admitted diuers additions by seuerall and sundry Popes appeares by their owne *Polidore Virgill*, whose words bee these:

All the Mysteries were deliuered by Christ to his Apostles barely and plainely, sauouring more of piety then outward shew; for Peter was wont onely to consecrate by

- Anno 423.* saying the Lords prayer; after this these mysteries were enlarged by Saint Iames, by Saint Basill; Coelestine added the entrance of the Masse, beginning with this Psalme, Iudge me oh Lord. Damasus added the confession which is made by the Priest before hee ascend vnto the Altar; some ascribe it to Pontianus; Gregory added the Antiphany which followeth the Entrance; and that Lord haue mercy vpon vs, should bee repeated nine times, with the Antiphonie after the Epistle, Gospel, and communion. Telesphorus added the hymne of glory to God on high. Gelasius added the conclusions of the prayers [as vpon Christmas day, because thou didst giue thine onely Sonne, &c. as is set downe in the book of Common prayer and vsed at the administration of the Communion by the Church of England] Ierom added the Epistle and Gospell, and that all men should stand up at the reading of the Gospell; Halleluiah they borrowed from the Church of Ierusalem; the singing of the Creed was added by Pope Marke the first; which Damasus afterward renewed; Gelasius added the Antiphony which they call Tractum, with the hymnes and prefaces which goe before the Canon, which are nine in number; the tenth to the honour of the Virgine Mary the mother of God. Pope Urbane added. Aaron first burnt frankincense on the Altar according as God commanded Moses; and Pope Leo the third commanded the same to be vsed in the Church, which also the Heathens did vse. The washing of the hands was a ceremony taken from the custome of the Iewes, and from the Gentiles, whose vse was to wash their hands when they sacrificed. Xystus the first appointed that in the preface, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabbath, should bee sung.
- Anno 577.*
- Anno 600.*
- Anno 129.*
- Anno 493.*
- Anno 336.*
- Anno 800.*
- Anno 170.*

sung. whereby it appears that the Canon of the Masse was neither all composed by one man, nor was digested into that forme wherein now it is. which appears by this that Pope Alexander the first who lived cccix. yeares before Gelasius and Syricius in memorie of the passion of Christ caused these words to be added, who the day before he suffered, vnto these words, this is my body; whereby it is euident that that was the beginning of the Canon. Leo I. afterwards added, therefore this oblation; and this holy sacrifice and immaculate host; Gregory annexed three prayers which are these, Dispose our dayes in thy peace, and deliuer vs from eternall damnation; and cause vs to be numbered among thine elect. So others added other things; after the Canon is ended, then is said the peace of God; then was appointed that the Priests should kisse one another by Innocent the first, and that the people should kisse the pax by Leo the second.

Anno 109

Anno 440.

Anno 408.

Anno 682.

Now for the ceremonies of the Masse, most of them were borrowed from the Iewes and ancient Idolatry of the Romanes instituted by Numa Pompilius their second King about 700. yeares before the incarnation of Christ.

As their shauing of Priests, which the ancient Idolatrous Romanes vsed after the forme of the Babylonians, or of the Herculean Priests, called for the same cause *Stephanophores*, as bearing a crowne vpon their heads; these were by the Heathenish Romanes tearmed *Curiones*, from whence our Romish Priesthood haue borrowed the name of Curate. Next the vestment of the Priest, which Numa Pompilius ordained to be White, called by the Latins *Alba*, and with

Curio sacerdos qui in sua cura, id est in sua parochia sacris praeerat, Tit. Liu l. i. dec. 3.

the Vestment hath continued to this day, wherein the Priest celebrateth Masse.

*Titelman. in
tract. de exposit.
ministe. muss.
Gab. Biel in lib.
de exposit. Miss.*

But our Romanists scorning to bee beholding to their Idolatrous Predecessours will haue this *Aulbe* to figure the conuersation of Christ in his flesh, or the purity of his body incarnate in the wombe of the Virgin. Others interpret the white colour to signifie chastity and continency. Others signifie by the *Aulbe*, the white garment presented by Herod vnto Christ, when he was sent backe as a foole to Pilate.

*Alexand. ab
Alexan. l. 4. c. 17
Super tunicam
pectori tegumen
Tit. Liu. l. 1.
decad. 1.
Purpureo vela-
re comes ad-
opertus ami-
cu, &c. Virgil.
enead. 3.*

About this, the old Roman Idolators vsed an ornament for the breast of brasse or copper, which is by the Church of Rome now turned into gold or siluer, tearmed the Cheafuble. They vsed also a vayle to couer their heads, called an Amice first inuented by *Aeneas*; which also our Masse Priests vse; and they wil haue it to represent the vayle wherewith Christ was couered, when the Iewes mocked him in the house of *Casphas*. Or the Diuinity of Christ hid vnder the humanity.

Adde vnto these the Stole, the Manuple, and the Zone: which three (saith one) do represent the three cords wherewith Christ was bound, and led before the High Priest. Or by the Zone (saith *Biel*) were figured the rods wherewith Christ was whipped; by the Stole laid a crosse, the crosse that Christ carryed on his shoulders; The Manuple carryed on the left arme represents the band of loue wherewith Christ was holden.

Another interpreteth the Zone or Girdle wherewith the *Aulbe* is trussed or tyed together, to signifie the band of the charity of God.

The Stole put vpon the Amice on the necke of the Priest in forme of the crosse to figure the obedience of Iesus Christ vnto the death of the Crosse.

The Maniple carryed vpon the left hand to figure the eternall felicity of Iesus Christ.

Another saith the Amice figureth Faith; the Stole humility of obedience; and the Maniple the watchfull and hearty deuotion of the Massing Sacrificer. Thus are they vncertaine among themselves of the figuratiue representations of their Sacrificall Vestments.

The next ceremonie was Holy-water borrowed from the ancient Idolaters of Rome, and inuented by *Numa*, who ordained that the people should bee sprinkled with sea, or salt water; because that salt was of a fierie nature which is apt to purifie; hereby they purged and cleansed the faults of the people, especially lying and periury.

Pope *Alexander* the first of that name, and one of the first corrupters of the holy sacraments, following the Idolatry of *Pompilius*, commanded this coniuering and consecrating of holy water, to driue away diuells. But to colour this witchcraft hee vseth this comparison. If it be so (saith Pope *Alexander*) that the ashes of a red cow, offered vp in sacrifices, mingled with water of the fountaine purified the people of the Iewes; by greater reason the water sprinkled with salt should purifie Christians and chase away diuells. Thus haue they continued that Idolatrous vse of Holy water still in the Church of Rome, which the Heathens did vse 360. yeares after Christ, as appears by that story of *Valentinian*.

*Procin. l. de sac.
& Gag. Procl.
Plarenicatu.
Eius aque as-
persione peccata
praesentim per-
iuria mendacia-
que delui cre-
debant. Blond. li.
de Roman. Tri-
umphi. Ouid
fast. lib. 3.*

*Si cinis vitulae
asperfus populi
ludicrum, &c.
Platina.*

*Hist. Tripart.
lib. 6. cap. 35.*

After

Titus Liv.

Supplicationes
quas nos proces-
siones vocamus,
seebant circa de-
lubra fanaque
& pulvinaria, in
quibus bonos
dij dabatur,
precedentibus
pueris ingenuis,
& sacerdotibus
coronatis, ac
Lauream tenen-
tibus manu, ac
voce modulata
cantantibus, car-
men, subsequen-
te Maximo
Pontifice, vel
curione, deinde
sequentibus pa-
tricijs ac sena-
toribus cum
coniugibus ac
liberis ple-
rumque corona-
tis. Apul. lib. 11.
de aureo Asino.
Blond. de Rom.
Triumph. li. 2.
Alexand. ab
Alexandro. lib.
5. cap. 27.

After the sprinkling of Holy-water followes the Procession which *Platina* ascribes to *Agapetus*, Bishop of Rome; but I find it well nigh a 1000. yeares before him practised by the ancient Idolatrous Romanes called *Supplication*.

The order of Procession instituted by *Numa*: either to appease the wrath of their gods, or to obtaine peace, or the fruits of the earth was this.

First, before the Procession went young children, then the Priests clad in white Vestments, singing hymnes, prayses, and songs vnto their gods; after followed the High Bishop (called by them *Pontifex Maximus*) which title was after giuen to all the Emperours of Rome that were not Christians (as appeares by their coynes and Sculptures) then the ancient Senators of Rome, and their wiues and children, with crownes on their heads.

In the Procession was carryed commonly the Pagent or shrine of *Iupiter* or *Anubis* by some of the Priests clad in white Vestments, their heads beeing shauen, and hauing a crowne vpon their heads. This crowne was in such repute, that the Emperour *Antoninus Commodus* himselfe being the High Bishop caused his head to be shauen, and to be crowned to beare the shrine of the god *Anubis*.

Before the shrine went a Torch-bearer, carrying a taper light in his hand: when Procession did passe through the streetes, there were appointed certaine places for station; during which solemnitie, the Temples were set open, the Altars and Images perfumed with Incense; the shoppes being shut, the Halles of Iustice closed, and the prisoners vnchained. What

more

more exact Analogy and proportion can there bee then betweene the Procession of the Idolatrous Romanes, and that which is now in vse among the Idolatrous Romanists?

After the sprinkling of Holy-water, and the procession were finished, *Numa* instituted the sacrificer should celebrate the sacrifice, being cloathed with his Aulbe, and Chasuale, his head crowned, and his beard shaven, who approached to the Altar, with a Taper light, which commonly was of Tede, or Pine-tree; Hee ordained also that the Priest should turne himselfe to the Altar, toward the East; which *Porphyrus* the Hereticke did not onely continue, but ordained also the porches, and images to be turned toward the East, that those that entred into the Temples in bowing themselves before them, might addresse their prayers toward the East; as the *Persians* worship the Sunne in the East.

Wherefore our aduersaries must needs confesse that there Altars erected toward the East, their lamps and wax candles, their Images reuerenced, nay worshipped in their Missall sacrifice, to haue taken their originall, not from the Law of God, but from the ancient Romane Idolaters.

Moreover it was ordained of *Numa*, that the Priest being thus compleatly attired, the Altar being furnished with lightes, and Images, should before all things make his *Confiteor*, and acknowledge his offences, and aske pardon of the gods, and goddesses, As *Pythagoras* affirms in his Golden Verses, and *Orpheus* in his Hymnes: For *Numa* iudged the Priest to bee well purged by his confession, but without this

Confi-

ab Alexand. l. 4.
c. 17. Blond. l. 1.
de Rom. Triump.

He sunt verti-
gines in sacris
a Numa institu-
ta dextram ad
esculium ferre,
& se in orbem
circumagere.
Blond. de Rom.
Trium. Macrob.
in Saturnal.

Blond. lib. 1. de
Rom. Trium.
Alexan. ab. Ale.
lib. 4. cap. 17.

Itiaci temporib
veteres non thu-
re, sed cedri &
citri fumo Deos
a dolebant. Plati.
Tit. Linius l. 3.
de ad. 3.

Confiteor the Sacrifice could not be well celebrated. Which was reuined by *Damasus* and *Pontianus* Bishops of Rome.

Next vnto these the turnings, tossings, crouchings, kissings, were to be vsed by the *Pompilian* Priest, for *Numa* supposed great holinesse to consist therein. Which are also in vse among the Masse-Priests; for as *Titelman* affirmeth the Priest in trauerfing the Altar maketh seauen Curties or Congies vnto the assistants in his Sacrifice, that he may drive away the seauen deadly sinnes, by the seauen-fold graces of the Spirit of God.

Vnto these wee may adde, the perfuming the Altar with Incense, for the Ancient Roman Idolaters were wont to vse in their Sacrifices, perfume of Incense, which they caused to be kept in a little vessell called *Acerra*, a Censour; with which incense the Sacrificer did perfume the Altar, Images, Houses, especially the Sacrifices of the god *Ianus* and the goddesse *Vesta*, which tooke pleasure in incense, and wine offered to them; for in the time of the *Traianes* Cedar and Citron were vsed for perfume. That the Romaines did vse Incense in their Sacrifices, appeares by the word Thus, which signifieth Incense being deriued of the Greeke Word *Thuo*, which signifies to sacrifice.

This Incense was brought into the Church by *Leo* Bishop of Rome, borrowing it from the Heathenish practise of the ancient Idolatours; by which Incense now saith *Titelman* is signified the prayer of the Priest, which doth mount vp into Heauen in a labour of sweetnesse, as the smoake of Incense and the censour

Censour doth signifie the grace of the Holy Ghost. *Biel* interprets the Incense to signifie *Mary Magdalen* anoynting of Christ, and because Christ was twice anointed, therefore the incense must be twice offered in the Missall Sacrifice.

Vnto these adde in the next place the Offertory of their first fruites to the honour of their gods and goddeses, and these the Sacrificer might carry to his owne house for the nourishment of himselfe, and his family. For when *Numa* had instituted diuers orders of Sacrificers; as *Bishops*, *Augures*, *Sautiens*, *Feciaux*, *Curions* and others, he ordained also meanes for their maintenance, and commanded out of the common treasure, meanes for their prouision; and many priuate persons following his example did the like; so that benefices became rich by foundations, some of which benefices were at the bestowing of the Prince or the Common-wealth, or of the Colledge of Bishops: Others were at the presentation of some priuate Patrons, and their Successours, by whom they were first founded. They had beside these, that which was offered at the Altar; and the first fruites when any of these benefices were voyde; they had also Annuals, Legacies, and Bequests which were giuen by the dead that the Priest might pray for them, as appeares this day by the ancient monuments of the Heathen Idolators.

They had also amerciaments, fines, confiscations, as the house of *Cicero* when he was banished, was confiscate to the Colledge of the Priests, and dedicated specially to the sacrifices celebrated in the Temple of the Goddesse *Libertie*. By which it appeares

*Blond. lib. 2. de
Trium. Rom.*

*Sacerdotiorum
sive beneficiorum
duo erant gene-
ra, unum quorum
collatio ad rem-
pub. aut princi-
pem, aut ad pon-
tificum collegium
spectabat, alterum
quorum collatio
ad aliquam fa-
miliam eiusque
successores perti-
nebat; quae bene-
ficia viris patro-
natus censeba-
tur. Blond. de
Rom. Trium. l. 2,*

*Cicer. in orat. pro
domo sua ad
Pontifices.*

that the Idolatries and Superstitious ceremonies of the Church of *Rome*, are not new in themselves but borrowed from the old Idolators of Heathenish *Rome*, practised before the incarnation of our Saviour Christ.

*Mysterijs pera-
-tu, qui sacris
intererant, ro-
tundis panibus
quos in honorem
Deorum adhi-
bebant, stantes
vescebantur. A-
lex. ab Alex. 1. c.
ap. 17.*

Neither can I here omit the ancient custome of the Romanes, which being paralelled with this of our aduersaries differs nothing from that vsed in the now Romish Church. For in the time of *Numa Pompilius* the Idolatrous Romanes, (after the mysteries of their worshippe were finished) did communicate within the Temple little Cakes consecrated to the honour of their Gods to whom they did offer their sacrifices.

These little round cakes or hostes were eaten by the Sacrificer and the assistantes, standing and not sitting.

The Flower whereof they were made, was called *Mola*, from whence is deriued this word *Immolare* to Sacrifice.

These little cakes were diuers according vnto the diuersity of their gods and goddesses, and had on them the Images of those gods or goddesses, to whom they were dedicated. From whom our superstitious Aduersaries haue beene bold to borrow their Idolatrous practise of offering a wafer cake with the Picture of Christ vpon the Crosse, which cake is no longer or it was, but (as they teach) is really transubstantiated into the very body of Christ.

Now must I here forget to set before the eyes of the Christian Reader, the behamour of the Masse-Priest, while he is offering his sacrifice. First he makes three crosse

crosses vpon the round host to signifie the threefold Doctrine of Christ, by the Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost; in pronouncing these words, *Hac dona, hac munera, hac sancta sacrificia illibata*. Other Masse Glossers interpret the third Crosse to signifie the treason of *Iudas*. Then followes five crosses more to figure the five dayes of respite betweene Palme-Sunday, and Good-Friday. Or otherwise the five wounds of Christ.

Of which five crosses, the three first are made to signifie the deliuering of Christ vnto the high Priest, Or to figure the price which Christ was sold for, to wit, three times ten which make thirty.

The other two crosses are made separately the one vpon the host, the other vpon the chalice alone, to play the two persons of Christ and Iudas, then hee stretcheth out his armes to figure Christ stretched on the crosse. Which done he maketh three crosses to represent the threefold estate of such as haue benefited by that sacrifice, namely, those in Heauen, on earth, in purgatory.

He smiteth afterwards his breast, to play the part of the Publican repenting in the Temple. But this smiting must be with the three hinder-most fingers; for the thombe and the fore-finger are reserved to consecrate and transubstantiate the Host into the body of Christ; moreover he smireth his breast three times, to figure the three-fold offence of thought, word, and deede. Then he eleuath the host to be adored. Then he listeth vp his voyce to represent the person of the theefe, or the Centurion which confessed Christ in his passion.

Six other crosses are againe made, three vpon the chalice couered, to represent the three houres that Christ hanged on the crosse aliu; and the other three on the chalice vncouered (with the round host lifted vp againe) to figure the three houres that Christ hanged on the crosse dead. Then he kisseth the chalice, and maketh two crosses to figure the water and blood that issued out of the side of Christ.

Then the Priest must take the couering cloath off from the chalice, and couer it with the patyne, to figure the breaking of the vaile of the Temple in the middest at the death of Christ. This done, the host is put from aboue the chalice and is couched vnder the corporas to figure the burying of Christ.

The Priest hauing thus acted the parts of Christ, of the holy Theefe, of Iudas, then acteth the person of the Centurion in singing the Pater Noster, by the seauen petitions whereof *Durandus* would signifie the seauen weepings of the Virgin *Mary*, or the seauen graces of the Holy Ghost, or the seauen Beatitudes, or the seauen deadly sinnes. This song finished, the Priest keepeth silence to signifie the silence, or rest of Christ in the Sepulcher.

Esay 1. 12.

Obiect.

Who sees not here a Masse of fopperies, and will worship in this sacrifice of the Masse? shall not God say vnto our Masse-mungers, as he did vnto the *Israhelites*. *who required these things at your hands?* where hath Christ either giuen precept or example to make such representations of his passion by externall mummeries, and histrionicall gestures?

But these things are of great antiquity, and haue beene of long vse in the Church, and why should

wee now become Innouatours.

Answer. I answere wee are not Innouatours because we abolish these Popish Idolatries, and keepe our selues to the practise of the Primitiue Church, but they are Innouatours, that haue brought these superstitions into the Church.

And whereas they pleade Antiquity; I answer, first Antiquity or continuance of an euill is no ground for a tolleration, and idolatry in religion is not to be permitted though neuer so ancient; for by the same argument may the Turkes iustifie their *Mahometan Alcoran*, which they haue possessed about 900 yeares; vnder the which law they haue subdued nations, conquered Realmes and Empires.

By the same reason might the Israelites iustifie the sacrificing of their children vnto *Moloch* in the valley of *Tophet*, a most detestable Idolatry, yet practised well nigh the space of 1200 yeares, till it was quite abolished by that good King *Iosiah*.

The Brazen Serpent, a thing commanded by God himselfe, possessed by the *Israelites* for the space of 2 Kings 18. 4. 900 yeares, vnto which the people had burnt incense from time to time; yet neither the long continuance, nor the generall practise of such an Idolatry could preuaile with *Hezekiah* for tolleration. Could the people of *Israel* be excused for committing Idolatry by the two calues of *Dan*, and *Bethel* erected by *Ieroboam*, and worshipped for the space of three or foure hundred yeares? No, the long practise of an euill, can afford no ground for permission; but Idolatry though neuer so aged is to be extirpated; as *Theodosius* the Emperour answered vnto the Senators

Senatours of *Rome*, when they pressed him with the antiquity of their *Pampilian* religion, which they had obserued for the space of 1000. yeares.

Againe, the Masse is not so ancient as our aduersaries pretend, neither in respect of the Canon, nor in respect of the Ceremonies, least of all in respect of the Sacrifice. The Canon being patched together by sundry Popes, who haue added their parts and parcels at seuerall times. The Ceremonies as the diuers garments, holy-water, wax-tapers, the Offertory Prayer for the dead, Procession, & the like, crept in also by degrees, one after another as their owne Histories declare sufficiently. And the sacrifice not acknowledged by any till within these 400 and odde yeares, about the time of the Lateran Councell, vnder *Innocent* the third.

Now let the indifferent Reader iudge of the impudencie of our Aduersaries who bragge so much of antiquitie, endeauouring to deduce their Masse from the Apostles time, against their owne consciences, and the credit of all hystories. For hereby clearly is declared the induction not onely of the Ceremonies but also of the very Canon of the Masse, all which do not fauour only of Innouation, but also of Iudaisme and Gentilisme; the badges of a false and superstitious Sacrifice.

The third generall part, of this confutation.

The third part of this confutation followes, wherein we shall giue answer vnto some of the maine and principall arguments wherewith they endeauour to establish their battered and shaken imposture, and to oppugne the inuincible truth of God and his Church. So that wilfully they ouerturne the very

Principles

principles of nature, the order of all things, the humanity of their Saviour, the truth of the Sacrament, the truth of Scripture, the foundations of all Divinitie; confusedly iumbling heaven and earth together, rather then they will admit of a tropicall speech in our Saviours consecration.

And first for the maintaining of the sacrifice of the Masse they alleadge. That *Christ is a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedech*; but the proper act of *Melchizedechs* Priesthood did consist in sacrificing vnder the formes of bread and wine. Ergo. The eternity of Christs Priesthood standeth in the sacrificing of his body and blood in those formes by those Priests whom hee hath promised to continue in his Church till the worlds end. *Rhemist. annot. Heb. 7. sect. 8. Bellar. cap. 6. Hoffmeyst. assert. sacrific. missa.*

Argum. 1.

Psalm. 110. 4.

Heb. 5. 6.

Rhem. annot.

Heb. 7. sect. 8.

Bellar. cap. 6.

Hoffmeyst. assert. sacrific. missa.

And that *Melchizedechs* Priesthood consisted in oblation of bread and wine, they would prooue by these Reasons.

First, from the word, *He brought forth*. The Hebrew word is properly applyed to the bringing forth of a sacrifice; as *Gen. 4*. The like word is vsed to signifye *Cain* and *Abels* sacrifice.

Bellar. c. 6.

Translators of

Doway. pag. 56.

annot. on Gen.

14. & pag. 57.

Secondly, because *Abraham* had no need of bread and wine to refresh himselfe, being returned with so great spoyle from his enemies, and so hauing sufficient to refresh himselfe with, it is likely *Melchizedech* brought them forth to offer to God.

Thirdly, as *Melchizedech* is said to be the Priest of the High God, so it was requisite that the Scripture also should make mention of his sacrifice; but this sacrifice is not mentioned else-where.

Bellar. cap. 6.

P

Fourthly,

Bellar. *ibidem*.

Fourthly, from the phrase of the words, *Melchisedech brought forth bread and wine, for hee was the Priest of the most high God*; the scripture alleadging this as a reason of his bringing forth bread and wine, because he was a Priest, and did it to sacrifice.

Bellar. *ibidem*.

Fiftly, Christ is said to bee a Priest for euer: but this Priesthood cannot remaine, except his sacrifice remaine: therefore seeing the sacrifice of Christ on the crosse is done, he must haue another sacrifice daily to be offered in the Church, and that is the sacrifice of *Melchisedech* in bread and wine.

Vnto these we answer seuerally.

Zanch. *de cultu dei externo*.
Exod. 3. 10.
Exod. 8. 18.
Psal. 135. 7.

First, concerning the word קָרַן *laxa* or *laksa*, which they say signifies properly to bring forth a sacrifice, this is false, for it properly imployes as much as *proferre*, to bring forth; as if he should say, *Exire fecit & adferri panem*, hee made bread and wine to bee brought forth, and the same word is vsed in this sense most commonly: as, *That thou mayest bring forth my people the children of Israel forth of Egypt. So the bringing forth of lice. Exod. 8. 18. The bringing forth of the winds, Psal. 135. 7. The bringing forth of water out of the rocke, and the like.* And where it hath any relation to a sacrifice, there it is ioyned either with the word sacrifice or oblation, restraining the generall signification thereof to the speciall act of offering or sacrificing.

Wherefore whereas many of them reade *It oblat, he suffered*: they corrupt the text, for it is *protulit, he brought forth*; and vnto this haue we the consent of all the Fathers, who note that it was rather a *manifest* act of his *Regall* office proceeding from his bounty

bountie and liberality, then any Sacrificiall act of his Priestly function.

Therefore Ierome translates it *Melchizedeck proferens panem & vinum*; and Cyprian, *protulit panem*. And thus doth Rabbi Salomon expound this place, saying, that *Melchizedeck* did testifie by this gift and good handsell, that he tooke it not in ill part that his posterity were slaine by Abraham.

Thus also Tertullian and Epiphanius render it, with whom consent some of their owne Writers. Caietan saith, *Nihil hic dictum est, &c.* Nothing is here said of sacrifice or oblation, but of bringing forth, which Iosephus saith was done to the refectiō of them that had gotten the victory, Andradius also doth herein forsake his friends, and acknowledgeth this to bee the true exposition; for in the defence of the Councell of Trent against Chemnitius, he hath these words. *wee need not Chemnitius to strine about the word offering; seeing that both in the best corrected Latin coppies, and also in the holy Fathers, which apply this place vnto the holy Eucharist, it is proferens brought forth, and I in iudgement agree with them which say that Melchizedeck refreshed Abrahams souldiers, wearied and fainted with long fight.*

Vnto this doth the Romish translation consonantly accord, where the word is *Proferens*, bringing forth, and not *offerens* offering; which translation the Papiſts are bound by the Councill of Trent sess. 4. not to reiect vpon what pretence soeuer.

The Chaldee Paraphrast saith, he brought, or caused to be brought; and the Greeke *hexeneghe*, hee brought forth. Ambrose, *protulit in refectiōnem*; and

Ier. in Gen. Cyp.
ad Caeilepi 82

bet. in Gen. alius
Gen. 2. th. d. 1.

Caietan, in Gen.

14.
Sic Lyra in loc.

Andrad. defens.
fidel. Trid. lib. 4.

Amb. in ep.
Hebr. 6. 7.

Posten in biblio.
Select. l. 4. c. 14.

Tertu. cont. Iud.
Amb. de Sacra-
ment. l. 4. c. 3.
Chrys. in Ps. 110.

Gen. 14. 23.

Willet. Synops.
papismi.

Hugo Cardinalis seems to hold him selfe satisfied with that sence, affirming that the Hebrew Doctours had so expounded it. And thus also Erasmus and Sigonius doe take it: for which they are reprooued by Possevine the Iesuite.

And it is to be obserued, that when any of the Fathers translate it *obtulit*, he offered, they referre it to Abraham, and not to God; Tertullian saith, *Abrahamo reuerenti de praelio obtulit panem & vinum*; and so Ambrose. *Occurrit Melchizedech & obtulit Abrahamo panem & vinum*. Melchizedech met Abraham, returning from the warre, and offered vnto him bread and wine. They say not that he offered to God, but to Abraham, and it had beene idolatry in Melchizedech to haue offered to Abraham religiously: wherefore he offered onely ciuilly; that is, hee made proffer of bread and wine to refresh him selfe and his soldiers.

Secondly, whereas they say Abraham had no need thereof, in regard he had taken a greet spoyle from the enemies, &c.

Answer, it appears not that Abraham had refreshed him selfe by the spoyle taken from the kings, because in the refusall of the profer made vnto him by the king of Sodome, he protests that hee would not take anything, saue onely that which the young men had eaten; where he reiects all the goods, excepting onely what the young men had eaten; whereas doubtlesse had hee tasted any refreshing in the spoyle, he would haue mentioned it, as being a thing properly taken by him; and therefore (as a late Diuine obserues) it was Gods providence to send Melchizedech that

that he should be refreshed rather at his hands, then by the king of Sodom a wicked Infidell.

But suppose *Abraham* had refreshed himselfe and his souldiours with the spoyle; yet what knew *Melchizedech* that; wherefore in curtesie, and to expresse his inward acuity, hee declares it by his outward liberality and bounty; and thus much may bee collected out of the words of *Iosephus*, who sayes, That *Melchizedech* ministred to *Abraham* and his host vi-
Et smalls and great aboundance of things necessary; and after the feast began to prayse him and blesse God who had subdued his enemies vnto him.

Lib. 1. Antiquit.

c. 11.

Thirdly, whereas they say, that *Melchizedech* being the Priest of the high God, it was necessary that his sacrifice should be mentioned, but no sacrifice is mentioned but his bread and wine.

I answer there is mention made of his sacrifice implicitly, for in that he is said to be a Priest, it presupposes his offering of sacrifice; neither is it of necessity that his sacrifice should be mentioned, seeing he might be a Priest, albeit the matter of his sacrifice be not nominated; and doubtlesse many things concerning *Melchizedech's* Priesthood were concealed according to the saying of *Paul*. Of whom wee haue many things to say, which are hard to be uttered, because ye are dull of hearing; yet *Paul* shewes whereby hee declared himselfe to bee a Priest, namely, in blessing *Abraham*, and receiuing tythes of him.

Heb. 5. 11.

But suppose the matter of his sacrifice be not specified, must it therefore needs follow that hee sacrificed bread and wine?

Fourthly, they ground vpon the phrase (for he was) alleadging

alleadging it as a reason why hee offered bread and wine, for he was (say they) because he was the Priest of the high God.

Caietan. in
Gen. 14.

But herein they discover their owne ignorance; for the Hebrew saith (*and he was*) or (*but he was*); So the Greeke *hen de iereus tou theou*; and the Chaldees Paraphrast; *Et erat minister coram Deo*, And he was a minister before God, whereunto Caietane assenteth, saying, And whereas it followeth in the vulgar translation; for he was the Priest, as though this were the cause of the offering, which is not in the Hebrewes (*ut causa sed ut separata clausula*) as a cause, but as a disjunctive participle; as if hee would say, *Melchizedech* was a king, which appears by this plentifull feasting of *Abraham* and his souldiours; and hee was not onely a King, but also the Priest of the high God; so that in this one verse is comprised both the Regall and Sacerdotiall office of *Melchizedech*; and vnto each of them is ascribed his proper act; for hauing named *King of Salem*, he sayes immediately brought forth bread and wine, noting therein his Regall munificence. Then mentioning his Priesthood he sayes, *and he was the Priest of the most High God*; and immediately shewing wherein he declares his Priestly office sayes, *and bee blessed him*; in the former is expressed his Kingly, in the latter his Priestly function.

Fiftly they say, the Priesthood of Christ cannot be eternall except there remaine a sacrifice, and there remains no sacrifice but of bread and wine, because the sacrifice vpon the crosse was finished at Christs death.

Vnto this we answer by denying the falshood of this

this argument in diuers points.

First, we say the *Priesthood* of Christ may remaine eternall, though the *Sacrifice* remaine not eternally *in sacrificing*; for (as I haue shewed formerly) the eternity of Christs sacrifice is not to bee iudged by the eternity of the act of sacrificing, but by the vertue and efficacie of the *Priest* and *Sacrifice*, which are so meritorious as to procure eternall saluation vnto all beleeuers for whom it was offered; and in this sense the *Priesthood* of Christ is said to be eternall.

Heb. 10. 14.

Againe, we affirme that the *Sacrifice* of Christ shall remaine for euer; not *in offering*, but *as hauing bene offered*; so the *humane nature* of Christ which was our *Sacrifice* shall for euer remaine hypostatically vnited to the *Deity*.

Heb. 7. 24.

Againe, it is not necessary that Christ should haue an externall *Priesthood* here on earth that should offer bread and wine, and bee after the order of *Melchizedech*; for in the time of the law there was an externall *Priesthood* after the order of *Melchizedech*, yet euen then was Christ a *Priest* after the order of *Melchizedech*; and as he had a sacrifice in fore, so now hath he in *substance*.

Willet. Synops. papif.

But we demand here, if the proper act of *Melchizedechs* sacrifice consist in bread and wine, why doth not *Paul* mention it: for in the historicall relation of *Melchizedechs* meeting of *Abraham*. Heb. 7. 1. he mentions those things wherein hee was a type of Christ, but neuer so much as names the bringing forth of bread and wine, as nothing appertaining to his *Priesthood*.

Parer, in 7. cap. ad Hebr.

And if the Church should continue a sacrifice af-

ter

ter *Melchizedechs* order, and haue no direction from Christ or his Apostles, it may soone erre in the maine point of Christian religion. *Hosius* and after him *Belarmine* saith, That this mystery was too great for the Hebrewes to conceiue; but by their leaue, the Apostle tells them of things as strange in a manner; of a man without *Father*, without *Mother*, without *beginning or end of dayes*. And if there had beene any difficulty, of whom might they haue beene more clearely and plainly instructed then of the Apostles? and why were not the Hebrewes as capable of this doctrine as any nation among the Gentiles?

cont. liter. Petil.
c. 16. d. 9.

And doubtlesse had the substance of the *Eucharist* consisted in the offering vp of Christ vnder the forms of bread and wine, both our Sauiour and his Apostles would haue spoken clearely of it, for as Saint *Augustine* to this purpose. *Let no man alleadge vnto me the things that are spoken darkely or figuratiuely, saith must be builded vpon that which is cleare, and not subiect vnto diuers interpretations.*

I will conclude this answer with shewing two things.

Melchizedech
a type of Christ
not *kata pantas*,
but *kata ti*.

First, wherein *Melchizedech* was a type of Christ; and in what respect Christ is said to be a Priest after the order of *Melchizedech*.

Secondly, the absurdities which will ensue vpon their doctrine.

Isay 9. 6.

1. He was a type of Christ in his name *Melchizedech*, which signifies *king of righteousness*; so was Christ.

2. In that he was *king of Salem*, that is, King of peace, so is Christ the Prince of peace.

3. In

3. In regard of his double office exercising publicly the sacred functions both of *King* and *Priest*; so did *Christ*.

4. In that he is said to be *apator*, and *ameter*, without father, without mother; so *Christ* was without father as man, without mother as God.

5. In the eternity and continuance of his office, for there is no mention made of his death, that therein he might be a type of the eternity of *Christs* priesthood.

6. In the excellency of his person, being greater then the Patriarch *Abraham*; which appears in blessing him. So is *Christ* above all men in regard of his humane nature, it being perfectly sanctified by the Godhead, and made the head of the Church. So that the bringing forth of bread and wine was no type of the *Priesthood* of *Christ*, albeit I deny not but it was a type of his *Regall* bountie and munificence, typifying the spirituall refection which *Christ* our King affords to all that warre against the enemies of their salvation.

Secondly, observe here the absurdities that will follow hereupon.

They say the order of *Melchizedechs* sacrifice consists properly in sacrificing bread and wine; & their Priests offer after the order of *Melchizedech*: hereupon it will follow that either *Melchizedech* offered vp the body of *Christ* vnder the formes of bread and wine, as they doe; which no man euer affirmed; or they offer only bread and wine as he did, and that they will neuer confesse; or else the sacrifice of *Melchisedech*, and of the Romanists being different, they must needs bee

*Vbiq̃ offertur
sub sacerdote
Christo, quod
protulit Melchi-
zedech quando
benedixit Abra-
ham. Aug. de
ciuit. Dei. li.
17. cap. 17.*

of different orders; and thus they wound themselves with their owne weapons; for if they will ground their sacrifice vpon *Melchizedechs* offering bread and wine, they must needs then confesse that in the Masse is offered nothing but bread and wine; and indeede the Fathers typically applying *Melchizedechs* bringing forth bread and wine to refresh *Abraham* and his souldiours returning from the slaughter of the kings, vnto the *Sacrament* of the *Eucharist*, make an apt and fit comparison; for so Christ by the bread and wine in the Sacrament (being eaten with faith in the thing represented) nourisheth all beleeuers, refreshing them in the skirmish against their spirituall enemies.

But *Bellarmino* thinkes to shake vs off, and to make vs loosen our hold by telling vs, That the sacrifice of the Masse, and the sacrifice of *Melchizedech* agree in the outward symboles and formes, though not in the substance, and that is sufficient; for the representation is in the accidents not in the substance, and that was but the type or Symbole, and therefore the substance may be diuers.

What hath *Bellarmino* aduantaged himselfe by this excuse? hereupon it will follow, that they who consecrate bread and wine onely doe more properly imitate *Melchizedechs* sacrifice, then the Masse-Priests who say they consecrate flesh and blood vnder the formes of bread and wine. In the one there is the forme and substance of *Melchizedechs* sacrifice; in the other the accidents alone.

Againe, if *Melchizedechs* sacrifice doth represent the sacrifice of the Masse, it must represent it as a sacrifice; but the Masse is no sacrifice but in respect of the

the inward substance, for the outward formes are not the sacrifice, but the body of *Christ* vnder those formes : *ergo Melchizedechs* sacrifice must represent the Masse in the substance which is the body of *Christ*.

Thirdly, types and shadowes differ from the body in outward symboles onely, but agree in substance, as *St. Paul* shewes, *Christ* to bee the same spirituall meate and drinke to the *Israelites* and vs, but to be sundryly represented by diuers Sacraments or representations; wherefore the sacrifice of *Melchizedech* and that of the Masse, (if it were a true resemblance of *Christ*s sacrifice) should differ in externall forme, but agree in substance.

Againe, if *Melchizedechs* Priest-hood be eternall by the offering of the body of *Christ* by the Priests of *Rome*, then it would follow, that either these Priests shal say Masse and offer this sacrifice after the consummation of this world, and the day of iudgement; or else *Christ* shall make choyce of some others, who may offer this sacrifice in Heauen; or else this sacrifice must cease, and so not be eternall; any of which no man of a sound minde or firme iudgement will admit.

Lastly, if *Melchizedechs* Sacrifice of bread and wine, were a type of the Masse, then should it be (as the Church of *Rome* holds the Masse to be) a true propitiatory sacrifice for the sinnes of the quicke and the dead, otherwise why should they so much labour to reduce their sacrifice to the sacrifice of *Melchizedech*, and so to make it more excellent then the Leviticall sacrifices, the excellency whereof cannot

cannot consist in the resemblance of the formes of *Melchizedech's* offering, but also in the vertue and efficacy. But no man euer sayd that *Melchizedech* offered a true Propitiatory sacrifice for the finnes of the quicke and the dead.

Thus much shall serue for answere vnto their first Argument.

Argum. 2.
Bellarmin. cap. 7.
Doway Transl.
page 190.

The second Argument is taken from the *Paschall Lambe*; and it stands thus. The *Paschall Lambe* was a figure of the *Eucharist*; but the *Paschall Lambe* was first sacrificed, ergo in the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* there is a sacrifice.

We answere, what if we should grant them the whole argument, they cannot glory much in their purchase, for what would be concluded, but what is already granted, namely, that in the *Eucharist*, there is a sacrifice, to wit, *Eucharisticall*, or at most *Hilasticke* by way of representation or recordation. But let vs grapple with our aduersaries a little more closely.

First wee doe confesse the *Paschall Lambe* and the *Eucharist* to haue some analogy and similitude; as that they both represent Christ crucified; as also they were both to bee eaten; the one with sowre herbes, the other with sorrow and repentance; thirdly in the end, for remembrance of deliuerance, the one corporall, the other spirituall. But againe, there were many dissimilarities, the *Passequer* was eaten with blood, the *Eucharist* without materiall blood. The *Passequer* was eaten at Even, the *Eucharist* is administred in the Morning; of the *Passequer* nothing was left, but of the *Eucharist*, is left and reserued by the

the Papists; the *Passeouer* was eaten in their houses, the *Eucharist* in the Church; seeing then they agree not in all things; why may they not disagree in the matter of a sacrifice.

But to speake precisely, we cannot grant the *Paschall Lambe* to be a Type of the *Eucharist*, albeit this succeeded in the roome of the other; but properly and directly to be a Type of Christ; according to the Euangelist, *That the Scripture should be fulfilled, not a bone of him should be broken*; and if the Typicall *Passeouer* was fulfilled in Christ, wee are not to seeke any other *Antitype*, wherein it should be accomplished. Furthermore it was not a Type of Christ in all things; for then as *Zanchius* obserues Christ shou'd haue beene sleade, and had his skinne pulled off, scorched in the fire, and his bones burnt, after the *Iewes* had eaten his naturall flesh, as they did with the *Paschall Lambe*; but as the Lambe was sacrificed, and eaten in remembrance of their deliuerance out of *Egypt*, so Christ was sacrificed on the Crosse, and eaten in the Sacrament for a remembrance of our eternall redemption by his meritorious Sacrifice.

*Sadcel. aduers.
missa sacrif. c. 4.
Iohn 19. 37.*

*Zanch. de cult.
Dei extern.*

Vnto the assumption we answere: It is not probable that the *Paschall Lambe* was sacrificed; because sacrifices were brought vnto the Priest, and offered by none but a Priest on the Altar; but the *passeouer* was slaine by the householder and all his family (as *Philo Iudeus* affirmes) without any Altar; now if our aduersaries will haue such an exact correspondency, why then should it not be as lawfull for a lay person to consecrate the host, as for a maister of euery fa-

*Lib. 1. vita
Mosk.*

mily to slay, dresse, and eate the *Paschall Lambe*, or for a multitude to consecrate and not one Priest alone.

Againe, it was not lawfull for an vncleane person to offer sacrifice till he had separated himselfe for some certaine season, according to the prescribed time of the ceremoniall Law; but no mans vncleannesse ought to exclude him from he *Passeouer*. *Numbers 9. 10. Ergo the Paschall Lambe was no sacrifice.*

*Sadeol aduer.
Miss. sacrif. c. 4.
Exodus 8. 26.
Exodus 12.*

Againe, the *Iewes* after the edifying of the Temple sacrificed not out of *Ierusalem*; yet were they accustomed in all their remouings from place to place, to eate the *Paschall Lambe* in the moneth appointed; And *Moses*, when *Pharaoh* permitted him to sacrifice in *Egypt*, refusing sayd, *It was not meete*, yet refused hee not to celebrate the *Passeouer* there; whereby it appeareth to be no sacrifice.

Marke 14. 13.

But *Bellarmino* to proue the *Passeouer* alleadgeth *Marke 14. 12. when they sacrifice the Passeouer*. But we must obserue that it is called a sacrifice *Katati*, after a sort, because it was slaine as the other sacrifices; and because it was a spirituall sacrifice: for the word *Zebach* which signifies a *sacrifice killed*, is often vsed about the ceremony of the *Paschall Lambe*, because it was killed as other sacrifices; and is vsed also sometimes largely for a spirituall sacrifice, as *The Sacrifices of God are a broken spirit.*

Psalme 51. 17.

But let it be granted that the *Paschall Lambe* was a Sacrifice, yet no otherwise then Eucharisticall for the remembrance of the great and admirable deliuerance of the *Iewes* out of *Egypt*. Yea, if we grant it

it to be propitiatory it helpes them not, but rather disaduantageth them in their practise; for if they will haue the *Paschall Lambe* to be a figure of the Masse, how comes it to passe that the former was offered with blood, this without, the one by the whole family, the other onely by the Priest; of the former nothing was to be reserved, but they reserue the host to be kept in the pyx; the former was not to be carried forth of the house; but the host is carried about in the streetes to be worshipped and adored.

Neither do the fathers compare the *Paschall Lamb* to the Eucharist or Lords Supper but onely in these three respects; first, that as the Iewes did eate the one, so do Christians the other. Secondly as the *Paschall Lambe* did represent *Christum moriturum*, Christ which was to die; so the Lords Supper doth represent *Christum mortuum*, Christ which hath dyed. Thirdly, as the one was in commemoration of the bodily deliuerance of *Israell* out of *Egypt*; so is the other in commemoration of our spirituall redemption out of the iawes of *Satan*.

Touching the first, namely, the eating of the *Paschall Lambe*, and the feeding on Christ in the Sacrament; *Chrysostome* speaks, *Hoc mysterium tradidit, &c.* Hee deliuereth this mystery, when the Law was to cease, and he dissolueth their principall solemnity, to wit, of the *Paschall Lambe*; and calls them to a terrible Table, saying, *Take eate, this is my body*. Where note that he calles it a Table to be trembled at, not because of the reall presence of Christ there, as the Papists expound it, but because of worthy or vnworthy communicating. So *Ierome*, *Our Pasfeouer is sacrificed, provided*

*Chrys. hom. 83.
in Math.*

*In cap. 26. Math.
lib. 4.*

that

In cap. 1. Esa.

that we eat it with unleavened bread of sincerity and truth: Basil sayth, Let vs celebrate the Pascheouer not in the leauen of malice & wickednes, but in the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth, seeing Christ who is the true Lambe is offered in the evening, that is in the end of the world, whose flesh is meate indeede.

Cont. Marcion
lib. 4.

Secondly, they compare it to the Eucharist in representing Christ. Terullian, Our Lord hauing declared that he desired to eat his Pascheouer (for it was indignity for the Lord to desire any thing but his owne) gaue and distributed it to his Disciples, and made it his body, saying, this is my body, that is a figure of my body. Thomas their owne Angelicall Doctor sayth, Seeing Christ our Pascheouer is offered let vs feast, feeding on Christ not onely Sacramentally, according to that of St. Iohn, If you eat the flesh of the sonne of man, &c. but also spiritually by enioying his wisdom.

Thom. in 1. Cor.
cap. 5.

Lyra. Exod. c. 12.

Lastly, they are compared, in respect of commemoration. So Lyra. All whatsoeuer Moses hath written hath relation to Christ, and therefore in the sacrificing of the Lambe there is a double sence; the one is the state of the people comming out of Egypt, & this is the litteral and first sence; the other is the fore-shewing and shadowing out of Christ, who was to be crucified; and this is the first in intention, though last in accomplishment. By which allegations, it appears plainly, that the ancients seldome or neuer call the Paschall Lambe a sacrifice, and in what respects they compare it to the holy Sacrament of the Lords Supper.

And thus much for answere vnto the second argument.

The third argument which is alleadged by the Ro- Argum. 3.
manists, and whereupon they most depend is ground-
ded on the prophesie of *Malachy*, chap. 1. 11. For
from the rising of the Sunne, to the going downe of the
same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in
euery place incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure
offering; for my name shall be great among the Heathen,
saith the Lord of Hosts. Seeing the sacrifice of the
Masse is so generally offered among all Gentiles:
therefore it must needs be that pure oblation foretold
by the Prophet *Malachy*. And that this Sacrifice
may the better appeare, *Bellarmino* alleadgeth these
reasons.

First, from the signification of the Hebrew word
Mincha, which properly betokeneth an exter-
nall Sacrifice made with oyle and incense, and ther-
fore cannot be vnderstood of Spirituall and internall
sacrifices. *Bellar. cap. 10.*

Secondly, it is called a pure offering, such as can-
not be polluted; but prayers may be polluted, onely
the sacrifice of the Masse cannot bee defiled by the
illnesse of the Minister.

Thirdly, the Prophet speaketh of such an offering
as was not in vse among the Iewes, saying, *I will not
accept any offering at your hands*, but spirituall sacrifici-
ces were in vse among them. *Verse 10.*

Fourthly, the Prophet speaketh directly to the
Priests, *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts vnto you, oh ye
Priests*; and reproouing their sacrifices, bringeth in a
new kind of offering, which a new Priesthood should
offer to God, which cannot be meant of spirituall sa-
crifices. *Verse 6.*

Answer.

Zanch. de cultu
Dei externo.

To these we answer: That the intent of the Lord by the Prophet is to oppose the Gentiles against the Jewes, and shew the difference betweene the Leviticall sacrifices which they defiled, and the spirituall sacrifices which should bee offered not by one nation onely, but by every people vnder the new Testament. Wherefore the Prophet doth comprehend the whole service of the Christian Church vnder these three heads.

1. The knowledge of God by the preaching of the Gospell.

2. Inuocation or calling vpon the name of the Lord by prayer.

3. Liberality towards the poore in workes of charity.

The first is shewed in these words, *From the rising of the Sunne to the setting of the same, my name shall bee great among the Gentiles.*

The second in these words, *and in every place incense shall be offered to my name.*

The third is signified by the word *Mincha*, or a pure oblation; for as Zanchius obserues by the names of bread and wine all beneficence and liberalitie is signified in the Scripture. So *Jacob* calls the Present, hee sent his brother *Esau Mincha*; and *Abigail* the present she brought to *Dauid* by the same name. But I tye not my selfe precilely to this exposition of Zanchius vnderstanding by *Mincha*, Beneficence, or Liberality.

Therefore I answer to *Bellarmin* that if he will haue *Mincha* vnderstood properly and not metaphorically, then it would follow that the Prophet did speake in

Ibid.

Gen. 33. 11.

1. Sam. 25. 17.

in that place of the Iewish ceremonies which should be vsed among Christians, but with more purity then among the Iewes: but the Papiſts confeſſe that hee ſpeaketh not of Iewish ſacrifices, but of the ſacrifices of Christians.

Againe, if he will haue *Mincha* to bee vnderſtood Metaphorically, then the Maſſe is but figuratiuely a ſacrifice, and not properly; at moſt it will bee but flower or bread without any *Transubſtantiation*, as *Mincha* was. And whereas *Bellarmino* inferreth that becauſe *Mincha* ſignifieth properly an offering of flower or bread with oyle and incenſe: therefore it cannot be vnderſtood of the ſpiritual ſacrifices of Christians, how vnſchollerlike (and therefore how vnlike himſelfe) doth hee argue? Who knowes not that many things are ſpoken figuratiuely, being applyed improperly from their natiue ſignifications to ſignifie things which indeed they are not, *I am a doore* (ſaith Chriſt) *I am the vine*; if theſe things be vnderſtood literally and not Metaphorically, we ſhall make but a bad conſtruction. But an example like this of the Prophet *Malachy*, may bee that of the Prophet *Eſay*, where ſpeaking of the Church of Chriſt among the Gentiles he ſaith, *And they ſhall bring all your breithren for an offering to the Lord out of all nations vpon horſes, and in chariots, and in litters, vpon mules, and vpon ſwiſt beaſts, vnto my holy mountaine Ieruſalem ſaith the Lord; as the children of Iſraell bring an offering in a cleane veſſell to the houſe of the Lord.* What muſt all Christians be properly ſlaine and offered as ſacrifices to the Lord or figuratiuely? or muſt they be brought to the terreſtriall, or to the ſpiritual and celeftiall Ieruſalem?

Eſay 66.20.

But *Bellarmino* vrges that the Prophet speakes of a pure offering which cannot be polluted, but spirituall sacrifices may be defiled by the offerer.

Math. 23. 19.

Heb. 13. 15.
1. Pet. 2. 5.

I answer, No holy action, as prayer, preaching, mortification, prayes, Almes-deeds, and the like, are sacrifices but onely as they are offered in and through Iesus Christ, so that in respect as they proceed from vs simply, they may bee defiled by our inherent corruptions, yet being offered through Christ they are pure and holy; for as our Sauour telleth vs, it is the *Altar that sanctifieth the gift*. So in Christ are all our sacrifices offered, and hee is the altar that sanctifieth them; and therefore saith the Apostle, *By him* (that is by Christ Iesus spoken of in the former verse) *let vs offer the sacrifice of prayse to God continually*. So the Apostle *Peter* calls the faithfull, *An holy Priesthood to offer vp spirituall sacrifices by Iesus Christ*. So that our spirituall sacrifices being offered on Christ our Altar cannot be contaminated by our finnes.

vers. 14.

Thirdly, whereas *Bellarmino* would perswade vs that the Prophet speaketh of such an oblation as was not in vse among the Iewes; we deny it, for he speaketh not of any new kind of oblation, but makes a difference betweene the impurity of the Iewish sacrifices, and the pure offerings of Christians, the one being offered with disdain, the other with true faith in Christ. And it appeares that the Prophets reproofe extendeth it selfe as well vnto the people as to the Priests, verse 14. *Cursed be he that bath in his flocke a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth to the Lord a corrupt thing*. Thus the people were blamed for bringing polluted bread, for offering the blind, the lame, and the sicke for

for oblations to God; and the Priests were blamed for accepting of such impure sacrifices.

They allcadge the iudgements of the Fathers, as of *Irenem*, *Iustine Martyr*, and *Augustine*, who haue applyed this place vnto the bread and the cup in the Eucharist or Lords Supper.

Iren. l. 4. c. 32.
Iustit. dial. cum
Tryphone. pag.
125. Aug. cont.
aduers. leg. &
proph. li. 1. c. 20.

We deny not that it may be applyed vnto the Sacrament of the Supper, but therefore it followes not, that thereby is giuen sufficient ground for the institution of a Sacrament; and yet admit this were a sufficient foundation whereon to build the institution of the Eucharist, yet not therefore of the sacrifice of the Masse, seeing (as I shall hereafter shew) there is irreconcilable difference betweene the holy Supper of our Lord Christ, and the blasphemous sacrifice of the Idolatrous Masse; and doubtlesse these Fathers that applyed this place vnto the Eucharist, neuer dreamed of any true reall Propitiatory sacrifice which should be offered by the Minister in the administration of the Sacrament, as appeares sufficiently by all their writings.

Moreouer (as one well obserued) if our aduersaries will haue this place vnderstood literally, then must the Priests of Rome not be after the order of *Melchizedech*, but after the order of *Aaron*; for the Prophet speaking of the same sacrifice, *chap. 3. vers. 3.* sayes that Christ at his comming shall *purifie the sonnes of Levi*, they shall be *Leuiticall*, but onely purified: but they will not grant themselves to be after the order of *Aaron*, but they are there called *Leuites* by the way of allusion (say they) assimilating them vnto the priests of the Law: but if they admit of a figurative speech

Sadeel denmi.
Christi sacrif.

in the persons offering, why not as well in the sacrifice offered?

I will conclude this answer with laying before your eyes the common consent first of the Prophet *David*, and the Euangelist *S. Iohn* the Diuine, and the Apostle *Paul*; then of the Fathers of the Church in succeeding ages.

Psal. 141. 2.

David vnderstands it of prayer and supplications, *Let my prayers come before thee as the incense, and the lifting vp of my hands as the euening sacrifice*, where the Prophet vseth the same word *Menoha*, which is vsed by *Malachy*; the one place giuing most cleere light vnto the other; for by incense is plainly meant prayer, and by the pure oblation the lifting vp of the hands.

Reu. 8. 3.

Thus the beloved Disciple of Christ expounds what is meant by this incense: *And another Angell came and stood at the altar, hauing a golden censor, and there was giuen to him much incense, that he might offer it with the prayers of the Saints vpon the golden Altar.* This Angell is Christ (as is shewed formerly) the censor is his *humanity*, the incense is his *righteousnes*, whereby our spirituall sacrifices of prayer and prayles haue their acceptance in the eyes of God. This place of *Malachy* may also seeme to be expounded by that of *Paul*. *I will therefore that men pray euery where, lifting vp pure hands without wrath and doubting.*

1. Tim. 2. 8.

Tertul. com.

Iudeos, pag 124.

Thus haue we the consent of Scripture; let vs see also the agreement of Fathers. *Tertullian* citing this place expounds it of spirituall sacrifices, which being pure, hee opposeth to the impure sacrifices of the Iewes; and in his booke against *Marcion*, he expounds

it of glorifying, and praying God, and of prayer proceeding from a pure conscience. Hierome on this 1. of Malachy hath these words; *Dicit, orationes sanctorum Domino offerendas esse non in una orbis provincia Iudea, sed in omni loco*: The Prophet here saith that the prayers of the Saints shall be offered, not in that one Prouince of Iudea, but in euery place. Chrysostom vnderstands it of the spirituall worship of God. Eusebius vnderstands it of prayer, lib. 1. de demonstratione Euangelica, c. 6. *Malachias nihil aliud significat, &c.* The Prophet Malachy signifies nothing hereby, but that neither definitiue at Ierusalem nor any other place, but in euery region, the Gentiles shall offer the incense and sacrifice of prayer (to di, eucharistiam) vnto God which is called a cleane sacrifice, not by blood, but by godly actions. Tertullian also expounds it of the preaching of the Gospell among all nations. And so Hieronim. vpon Esay saith, *The sound of the Apostles is gone throughout all the ends of the world, euery where there is sacrifice offered to God: And herein is accomplished the word of the Prophet, namely in this, that God is purely preached, and purely called vpon in euery place.* Theodoret expounds it of the abolishing the Iewish sacrifices, and of the seruing of God in spirit and truth, as our Sauiour af firmeth in his speech vnto the woman of Samaria.

And whereas they obieet some Fathers who haue vnderstood it of the Eucharist, wee haue alleadged both the same Fathers and others with them expounding it otherwise.

Againe, if thole places be well considered, we shall finde the Fathers to apply this place to the Lords Supper.

Contra Mar.
l. 3. pag. 212.
l. 4. pag. 223.
Hier. in 1. Mal.

Chrys. tom. 2. in
Mat. hom. 17.
column. 1183.
Item tom. 5. in
orat. 2. aduers.
Iudeos. col. 1107.
Euseb. lib. 1. de
demonst. Euang.
cap. 6.

Tertul. aduers.
Iudeos.

Hier. in Esa. ca.
52.

Theod. in 1. Mal

Iren. cont. here.
Valent. l. 4. c. 32.

Idem cap. 33.

Idem cap. 34.
Hæc loca Irenæi
impudenter tor-
quet Hoffmeister.
in assert. sacrif.
Misse.

Supper not for prooffe of any Propitiatory sacrifice, but onely for a sacrifice Eucharisticall and of thanksgiuing: as first. They obiekt *Ireneus*, l. 4. c. 32. whose words are these, *Christus suis discipulis dans consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, (non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi, nec ingrati sint;) eum qui ex oreatura panis est accipit, &c.* Noui Testamenti nouam docuit oblationem: quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in vniuerso mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis prestat, primitias suorum munerum in nouo Testamento, de quo *Malachias* presignificauit. Et paulo post. In omni loco incensum offertur nomini meo, & Sacrificium purum; incensum *Ioannes* in Apocalypsi orationes esse ait Sanctorum. Et capite sequenti. Quoniam igitur cum simplicitate Ecclesia offert iuste munus eius, purum sacrificium apud Deum reputatum est, quemadmodum *Paulus* *Philippensibus* ait. Repletus sum acceptis ab *Epaphrodito*, &c. Oportet enim nos oblationem Deo facere & in omnibus gratos inueniri. Atque ibidem. Offerimus non quasi indigenti sed gratias agentes donationi eius, & Sanctificantes creaturam; quemadmodum enim Deus non indiget eorum que a nobis sunt; sic nos indigemus aliquid offerre Deo, sicut *Salomon* ait, qui miseretur pauperis fœneratur Deo. Christ giuing counsell vnto his Disciples to offer vnto God the first fruits of his creatures, not as of any necessity in God, but that they might not be vnfruitfull or vngratefull, tooke that which by creation is bread, and gaue thanks, saying, This is my body, &c. teaching that in the new Testament, there is a new oblation; which the Church taking from the Apostles offereth throughout the whole world vnto God, the first fruits of his gifts in the new Testament, to him that gi-
ueth

with whatsoener food and nourishment we haue, which *Malachi* foretold.

There is no question but *Irenæus* here speakes of the Lords Supper: but is there one word which can intimate any Propitiatory sacrifice? No, hee calls it an offering in two respects.

First, that wee might not seeme vngratefull vnto God, but should offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiuing.

Secondly, that we should not be vnfruitfull, and therefore should offer vnto God our first fruits, according vnto the ancient Custome of the Christians, who were wont at the celebration of the Lords Supper to send their offering, whereof part was taken to furnish the table with bread and wine; a second part was distributed to the poore; and a third part went to prouide necessaries for the Church: so that here is mention made of an Eucharisticall, but not of a Propitiatory sacrifice; of the offering of fruits and things without life, and not of the reall offering of our Lord Iesus Christ, of a solemne thanksgiuing for good things receiued, and not of any atonement or pacification of Gods wrath for sinnes committed. And what this incense is whereof *Malachi* speaketh, *Irenæus* declares, saying, *Euery where incense and pure sacrifices are offered to my name; Saint Iohn in the Apocalyps hath called the prayers of the Saints, the offering of incense.*

And againe, *In as much as the Church offereth in simplicity and singlenesse of heart, her offering vnto God is by good right reputed a pure and vndefiled sacrifice, as Saint Paul saith to the Philippians, I was filled hauing*

receined of Epaphroditus the things which you sent, an odour of a sweet smell a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God, for it behooveth that we offer up our sacrifices to God, that in all things we may be found thankfull. And this offering hee further makes plaine by that which followes, saying, we offer unto him, not because he standeth in need, but that we may be thankfull unto him for his gifts, and so by this meanes sanctifying the creature: for as God hath no need of any thing proceeding from us, so have we need to offer unto him, according to that which Salomon saith, He that pitteth the poore, lendeth to the Lord.

Now in all this place which they make so sure a ground for their sacrifice of the Masse, where is one word of sacrificing Christ, or of any Propitiatory host? yea rather doth not Irenæus directly specify a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and of charity, in as much as that which is giuen to God, is giuen to the vse of our neighbour, and that which is giuen to the poore is sacrificed to God.

Justine Martyr
Dial. cum Tryp.

Secondly, they object that of Justine Martyr, where he calleth the bread and wine the sacrifices of the Eucharist. His words are these, we are truly made the Priests of God, according to that which he witnesseth himselfe, because that throughout the whole world there are offered unto him pure and acceptable sacrifices. He addes, *Præcepit panem facere Eucharistiam in memoriam passionis*, He tooke bread to make the Eucharist in remembrance of his passion. But to what end? To offer for a propitiatory sacrifice? No, but he declares the reason, *Ut gratias agamus Deo tum pro eo, quod mundum cum omnibus, hominis gratia condidit: tum ob id etiam quod*

quod ab omni in qua fuimus malitia nos liberauit, ac principatus potestatesque perfecta occiderit occidione, per eum qui de consilio & voluntate eius factus est patibilis, That we should render than kesunto God, as well for that he that created the world, and al that is therein, for the vse and benefit of man: as also for that hee hath deliuered vs from all the malice whereunto wee stood subiect, and hath slaine with a perfect slaughter the principalties and powers which did oppresse vs, by him who by his will and counsell was made to suffer.

Out of which words the most subtle Papist is not able to prooue either directly or by consequence that *Iustine* alloweth in the Eucharist any Propitiatory sacrifice, but onely Eucharisticall and of thankesgiuing. And therefore *Langus* is condemned by the Councell of Trent to be rased, because hee hath not expounded this place after their manner.

Index expurg.
pag. 75.

Cont. aduers.
leg. & proph.
l. 6. 30.

Thirdly, they obiēt that *Augustine* expoundeth this place of the sacrifice of *Melchizedech*, and applyeth it to the Eucharist. Wee grant it. But the words following declare that both the sacrifice of *Melchizedech* (if it may be granted that he sacrificed bread and wine) and the Lords Supper are both but sacrifices of prayle and thankesgiuing, his words be these. *Ecclēsia immolat Deo in corpore Christi sacrificium laudis, &c.* The Church sacrificeth to God in the body of Christ the sacrifice of prayse; seeing the God of Gods hauing spoken, hath called the earth from the sunne rising vnto the setting thereof: for this Church is the spirituall *Israell*, distinguished from the carnall *Israell*, which serued God in the shadowes of sacrifices, in which was signified and set forth this singular sacrifice, which *Israell* according

to the spirit now offereth. Out of the house of this Israel he hath not taken any calves; for in it are offered, and sacrificed unto God the sacrifice of prayse.

Where we see manifestly that *Augustine* shewing the difference between the sacrifices of the Jewes, and of the Christians declares the Jewes to haue onely the shadowes of the sacrifice of Christ, but vs to haue the true sacrifice, which wee celebrate with praise and thankesgiuing. And he addeth afterward, saying, *In eu'ry place incense is offered to my name; And Saint Iohn expoundeth it in the Apocalyps, the prayers of the Saints.*

Ibid.

Thus haue wee hunted them out of their chiefest starting hole, euen this place of *Malachi*, clearing it from all pretence of the sacrifice of the Masse both by consent of Scripture and of the Fathers; as also freeing the objected testimonies of the Ancients from their corrupt expositions.

Argum. 4.

*Bellar. l. 1. de
missa. c. 15.*

The fourth argument follows. And it is *Bellarmines*, who argues thus against vs for the maintaining of his Sacrifice. *If the Fathers had thought that the Eucharist were a Sacrament onely and not a sacrifice also (meaning Propitiatory) they could not haue spoken otherwise of the Eucharist then of Baptisme; but the Fathers neuer call baptisme a sacrifice, or say, that to baptize is to sacrifice. Therefore the word Sacrifice was vsed by the Fathers in a proper sence.*

Whereby he doth clearly grant that the word *Sacrifice* attributed by the ancient Fathers vnto the Eucharist, may be interpreted *Metaphorically*, if once it could be shewed, that the same Fathers haue applyed the same word *Sacrifice* vnto the Sacrament of Baptisme.

tisme. Otherwise their Iesuite Suarez, would not so
urgently haue moued his Reader principally to Ob-
serue against Heretickes (so he calleth Protestants) that
the holy Fathers of ancient times did neuer call the Mi-
nistry of baptisme by the name of a sacrifice, although
metaphorically it might be so termed, therefore it is a
signe that when they terme the Eucharist a sacrifice,
they name it so properly.

Suarez Iesuit
tom. 3. disp. 74.
Sec. 3.

Seeing then the parallell of Baptisme may giue
our aduersaries their demanded satisfaction, we de-
fine them first to consult with St. Augustine, who ex-
pounding that place to the Hebrewes, chap. 10. Vnto
them that sinne voluntarily, after they haue obtained
the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sa-
crifice for sinne, sayth, *Nullad ad Hebreos diligentius
qui pertractant, sic intelligunt, ut non de sacrificio
contribulati per penitentiam cordis accipiendū sic quod
dictum est (non adhuc pro peccatis relinquitur Sacrifici-
um.) sed de Sacrificio de quo tunc loquebatur Apostolus,
id est, Holocausto dominice passionis; quod eo tempore
offerat quisque pro peccatis suis, quo eiusdem passionis fi-
de dedicatur, et Christianorum fidelium nomine bap-
tizatus imbutur, ut hoc significaret Apostolus, nempe,
non posse deinceps eum qui peccauerit, iterum baptizan-
do purgari, &c. That it is not to be understood of a sa-
crifice of a troubled spirit by repentance, but of that sa-
crifice wherof the Apostle spake, that is, that the Holocaust
or burnt offering of the Lords Passion, which every one
offers at that time for his sinnes, when he is dedicated
by faith in the same passion, and being baptized is en-
dued with the name of a faithfull Christian, that the
Apostle might signifie thus much; That he that sinned,
could*

August. tom. 4.
expof. ad Rom.
pag. 1185. 791
ad 1187.

Sal. Ies. in Heb.
10. disp. 39.

could not afterward by baptisme bee purged. And let them looke vpon their Iesuite *Salmaron*, who doth not vtterly reiect that interpretation.

Melchior Canus
loc. Theol. l. 12.
§ Quid igitur
fol 434.

And to the end they may rest sufficiently satisfied, they may be contented to consult with their learned Reader of *Spaine*, who renders the reason why most of the fathers did call Baptisme a sacrifice; which they did (sayth he) *Metaphorically*, that is, figuratiuely his words are these: *Sed quæris quid causa plerisq; antiquorum fuerit, ut Baptismum hostiam appellauerint, id eoque dixerint non superesse hostiam pro peccatis, quia Baptismus repeti non potest; Sanè quia Baptismo commorimur & per hoc Sacramentum applicatur nobis hostia crucis ad plenam peccati remissionem: Hinc illi per Baptismum translati hostiam nuncuparunt, & post baptismum semel acceptum nullam hostiam esse reliquam interpretati sunt, quia baptismus secundus non est.* Neither may we thinke that the calling Baptisme a Sacrifice is a solecisme in Diuinity, seeing the Apostle speaking of rebaptizing, calles it a recrussifying of Christ; as *Salmaron* obserues rightly out of Pope *Clemens*; and their Iesuite *Ribera* confirms it out of *Chrysostome*, *Theophilact*, *Oecumenius*, and *Damascene*.

Riber Iesu. com.
in Heb. 6.

Chrys. in Heb.
hom. 16.
Tertul. de bapt.

And how could our aduersaries doubt that the fathers would call Baptisme a sacrifice, who haue so vsually called it the Passion slaying and crucifying of Christ. *Baptisma est passio Christi*, sayes *Chrysostome*, Baptisme is the passion of Christ. *Tingimur in passione Christi*, sayth *Tertullian*, we are dipped in the passion of Christ. But how is it called a sacrifice or the Passion of Christ, properly or figuratiuely? Let their owne Iesuite answer for vs in this point. It is named a crucifying of Christ (sayth he) because it is a similitude of Christs Passion.

Ribera.

VWhere.

Wherefore by this Analogy betweene these two Sacraments of Baptisme and the Eucharist, wee may conclude out of the testimony of St. *Augustine*, recorded by their ancient Schoole-man *Aquinas*, That *Aug. ad simpli. referre Aqui. par. 3. q. 83. art. 1.* names of things are given to the signes of the same things which are represented; as for example, the painted image of Cicero wee use to call Cicero; and so the celebration of this Sacrament, (namely of the Lords Supper) which is a representation of the Passion of Christ the true sacrificing, is called an immolation. Where we see their owne Doctor agreeing with *Augustine*, and we consent with them both in this, that the Eucharist may bee called a sacrifice, as a Picture may be called by the name of the thing which it representeth.

A fifth Argument which they alleadge followes, and it is grounded on the words of *Esay*, But yee shall be named the Priests of God. Againe, And I will also take of them for Priests, and for Levites sayth the Lord. And, Them will I bring vnto my Holy mountaine and make them ioyfull in the house of Prayer, their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shalbe accepted vpon mine Altar. This (say they) must bee vnderstood of the Christian Church, wherein the Prophet *Esaia* fore-telleth, that there shalbe externall Priests, Altars, and Sacrifices, whereby must needs be vnderstood the sacrifice of the Masse.

We answere, first by deniall of the consequence; for, because the Prophet sayth, there shall be in the Church of Christ, Priests, Altars, Sacrifices, therefore it must be an externall Priest-hood, materiall Altars, proper sacrifices; this is a plaine *Non sequitur*.

147. For who sees not that the Prophet expressing the VVorship of God vnder the Gospell alludes vnto the ceremonies of the Law; and by an externall Legall Priest hood, and sacrifice, figuratiuely intimates that which is Spirituall and Euangelicall.

Thom. Opusc. 70.
3.1.1.

Now from things that are spoken Metaphorically and allusiuely, to inferre a proper and direct conclusion is no good forme of arguing: For it is the opinion of their greatest Schoole-man, *Symbolicam Theologiam non esse argumentatnam*. That Symbolicall, Metaphoricall, or Allegoricall testimonies proue nothing. And if wee will not vnderstand these and the like speeches figuratiuely, but litterally, then must all Christian Churches be raced downe, and we must be constrained to build *Ierusalem* againe, to reedifie the Temple, to erect a new Altar, to seeke Priests out of the Linage of *Lew*, according vnto the words of the Prophets, and so there should not in euery place be offered a pure oblation, (according to that of *Malachie*) but onely at *Ierusalem*; not of any of the Gentiles, but onely of the Iewes. Wherefore when *Esaias* sayth, *Ye shall be called the Priests of God*, Hee meanes not the Masse-Priests of *Rome*; but hee speakes of the godly whom *Peter* calles a *Royall Priest-hood*.

1 Peter 2. 9.

And it is to be obserued that all those who are not Priests in this sence, the Prophet calls them strangers, and accounts them as the sonnes of Forrainers: For all that are not holy to the Lord, being called to the sacred Priest-hood of the new couenant, are deemed but as men *without Christ*, *aliens from the common-wealth*

Eph. 2. 12.

wealth

wealth of Israel, Strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and being without God in the world; but this our aduersaries note not.

Againe, the Prophet doth not establish the Iewish rites and ceremonies, but by them shadowes forth the Christian worship. So *Esay* prophecied that *there should be an Altar in the midst of Egypt*, and a publicke profession of true Religion, but it cannot be spoken of the Romish Altars, or Massing-Sacrifice. So prophecying of the spirituall worship of the Church of Christ, he sayes, *All the flockes of Cedar shalbe gathered together vnto thee, the Rams of Nebaioth shall minister vnto thee, they shall come up with acceptance vpon mine Altar, and I will glorifie the house of my glory.* Who is so ignorant as once to iudge, that these things are properly spoken, and litterally to be vnderstood? or once to thinke that that there should be any bloody sacrifices of beasts and cattell in the Church of Christ? *St. Iohn* in his *Apocalyps* mentions in Heauen, an Altar, Incense, Censers, Temple, Arke of the Couenant.

Esay 19. 19.

Esay 60. 7.

What sound Christian abhorres not from so grosse an interpretation, as to thinke these things to be materiall, and so to be litterally vnderstood? and not rather that the Prophet, Apostle, and Euangelist speake allusiuely, both in the names and things, comparing, the spirituall worship of the Church Militant, and the glorious state of the Church Tryumphant vnto the ceremoniall worship of the Leuiticall Priesthood. And that the former places are thus to be interpreted, the consent of the Fathers will manifestly declare.

Cyp.de unct.
Chrysm.

Orig.in leuit.
hom.9.

Cyprian sayes, *All Christians do offer vnto God a dayly sacrifice, being ordained Priests of holinesse*; where note he excludes no Christian from the office of this spirituall Priest-hood, nor from offering a dayly sacrifice; and what the Romanists will haue only to be vnderstood of the Clergy, he will haue also applyed to the Layety. With him assents Origen saying, *All such as are annoynted with the holy unction, that is, with the Spirit of Christ, are made Priests*. All the rest of the Antients agreeing hereunto in the exposition of the former places; so that from them the Papists can collect no pretence for either sacrifice or Priest-hood.

Argum.6.

In the next place they assault vs with those proofes of *Daniel chap. 8. 11. and chap. 11. 31. and chap. 12. 11.* where the Propheer (say they) foretellet that Antichrist shall cause the *dayly sacrifice* to cease which (say they) is the sacrifice of the Masse.

Herevnto we answer by shewing two errors in this Argument.

First, in that they apply the places to the times of Antichrist.

Secondly, that they by a false consequence will haue this *iuge sacrificium, dayly sacrifice*, to be the sacrifice of the Masse.

For the first, he who should cause the dayly sacrifice to cease is not Antichrist, but was vnderstood of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, hee was that *little horne* foretold *chap. 8. 9.* who came of the stocke of *Seleucus Nicanor*, who was one of those to whom the fourth part of *Alexanders* mighty Monarchy was diuided. For the *Goate* spoken of in this Chapter, is the *Greci-*

Charionis Chron.
12.

an Monarchy; that one horne was Great *Alexander*, which horne, being broken by death, there arose foure hornes: the Monarchy was diuided into foure parts, whereof *Seleucus Nicanor* had one, (of whose stocke came forth this little horne, *Antiochus Epiphanes*) he raigned in *Syria*; *Ptolemus* another, who was created King of *Egypt*. *Antigonus* had the Kingdomes of *Asia*; and *Cassander* commanded *Greece*, and *Macedony*.

And that *Antiochus Epiphanes* was of the stocke of *Seuleucus Nicanor*, appears by his pedigree, for he was the sonne of *Antiochus* the Great, who was the sonne of *Seleucus Callinicus*, who was the sonne of *Antiochus Theos*, who was the sonne of *Antiochus Soter*, who was the sonne of *Seleucus Nicanor*; and he is called a Little-horne, because he was the yongest of his brethren, and so most vnlikely to attaine the Kingdome, but being left a pledge vnto the *Romans* at *Rome* he escaped thence, and returned into *Syria*, (where his brother *Seleucus* surnamed *Philopator* being vnfit for the gouernment) hee obtained the Kingdome.

In his second expedition against *Ierusalem*, hauing taken the City, he caused the bookes of the Scriptures to be burnt, the dayly sacrifice to cease for the space of two thousand and three hundred dayes, which make six yeares, three moneths and a halfe, and caused an Idoll of the Gentiles to be set vp in the Temple, and worshipped of the Iewes, which was the abomination of desolation prophesied by *Daniel*; which Idoll stood in the Temple a thousand two hundred and ninety dayes, which make three

T 2

yeares

Matth. 10.
Char. Chron.
Mac. 4. ver. 5.

yeares six months, and odde dayes; so that hee began his raigne in the 137. yeare of the Grecian Monarchy (the beginning whereof was reckoned from the death of *Alexander the Great*) and in the 143 yeare he entred into the Sanctuary and profaned it, and in the 145 yeare on the fifteenth day of the moneth *Cassien* which is our *November* he caused the *Idoll of abomination* to be set vp in the Temple of the Lord; and in the 148 yeare in the moneth of *Zanthicus* which is our *Aprill*, the King gaue liberty for the purging of the Temple, and on the 25 of the moneth *Cassien* was it cleansed and sanctified againe. This was in the 348 yeare after the *Babylonian* captivity, and 152 yeares before the nativity of Christ. And this is sufficient to cleare this place of Scripture from the misinterpretation of our aduersaries, who against all reason would haue it applyed to the times of Antichrist.

Ioseph: de antiq.
lib. 10. cap. 14.

Iosephus thus expounds it, affirming that whatsoever touching this matter was foretold, the Iewish nation suffered by *Antiochus Epiphanes*.

Lyran. in 8. x.
11. Dan.

Thus also doth *Chrysostome* expound it, saying, *The custome of the Iewes was to offer a sacrifice euening & morning, and every day, and they called this sacrifice, (entelechismon) a continuall action; now Antiochus at his comming tooke away the same.* And with him doth ioyne *Nicolas Lyra*, referring both the eight and eleuenth of *Daniel*, vnto the dayes of *Antiochus*. Many of the ancients expound this place of the rooting out of the Iewish Priest-hood, fulfilled in the vtter Catastrophe and ruine of *Ierusalem* by *Titus Vespasianus*; wherevnto Christ Iesus the true expounder of the Law and the Prophets, hath referred this place.

place, saying, *when you shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the Prophet set in the holy place, &c.* And thus doth Origen expound it saying. Daniel doth signifie and note out vnto vs, the *seauenty yeares after the comming of our Lord; for this weeke doth confirme and ratifie the testament, &c.* And in the midst thereof the sacrifice of the Altar was taken away euen in the 35 yeare, and so was accomplished that which had bene written: *In the midst of the weeke, &c.* Then also was the abomination of desolation, &c. when they saw Ierusalem besieged.

Mathew 24.15.
Orig. in Matth.
Matth. 29.

I do not deny but that *Antiochus* was a type of Antichrist, for as the former set vp an Idoll in the Temple, so this latter sets vp images in the Church; the one burnt the Scriptures, the other conceales them from the lay people; the first hindred the dayly sacrifice, and this latter hath conuerted the great sacrifice of Christ into an abomination, in that the Priest must offer a propitiatory sacrifice for the sinnes of the quicke and the dead, greater abomination then this was not in the dayes of *Antiochus*.

Secondly, let vs grant that this prophesie is to be fulfilled in the dayes of Antichrist; yet how shall it be prooued that this *Iuge sacrificium, dayly sacrifice*, is the sacrifice of the Masse? Let this bee first prooued, and wee shall soone yeelde the cause. In the originall there is no mention made of a sacrifice, but the word *Iuge, daily*, without any substantiue; must there needs be vnderstood sacrifice? why then doth *Ierome* call it *Iugem cultum*, the dayly worship of God; and *Theodoret Ecclesiasticum cultum*, the Ecclesiasticall worship or seruice of God? yet both of these restraine this prophesie to the time of Anti-

Tremel. in loca.
Danielis.

Ori. in Rom. 1. 10.

Chrys. in Rom.
hom. 29.

christ. So Tremellius translates it. Why may it not be vnderstood of the preaching of the Gospell, which shall be much hindered by Antichrist, seeing that is Metaphorically a sacrificing worke; Origen calls it *hieourgikon ergon*, a sacrificing worke; and Chrysostom; *Sacerdotium meum est predicare Euangelium*, My priesthood is to preach the Gospell. But let vs grant it is to be vnderstood of the Eucharist, and that this is called a sacrifice; but how any other then Eucharisticall, or of thankesgiuing? but let it be granted to bee vnderstood of the Lords Supper, and it is called a Propitiatory sacrifice: how any otherwise then by representation? how any otherwise then of commemoration? Thus the ground whereon they build, shrinks from them, as refusing to become a foundation for such a tottering fabricke.

But against this interpretation of our Antagonists, let vs oppose Socratically, and by the way of interrogation, desiring them to answer to these demands.

First, why doth not the Apostle Saint Paul. 2. The. 2. and Saint Iohn the Apostle and Euangelist. 1. Ioh. 4. 3. Reuel. 17. and 18. in their description of Antichrist, make mention of this place of Daniel, or of taking away for a time this *Iuge sacrificium*, daily sacrifice; or hindering the sacrifice of the Masse? Doubtlesse, had Daniell spoken of Antichrists taking away the sacrifice of the Masse, the Apostles would not haue either forgotten, or willfully pretermitted so great a matter. But by their forgetfulness, we may conceiue the Masse not to be worth remembring; or by their voluntary omission, we may iudge it indigne and vnworthy to be spoken of.

Secondly,

Secondly, I demand how Christ is euer with his Church vnto the end of the world? Turrian answers for all the rest, Christ is with vs in the mystery of the Masse; but then I require againe, whether Antichrist shall take away the Masse for a thousand two hundred and ninety dayes? Turrian and with him Vega answer, saying, Gabriel that cannot lye, saith that Antichrist shall abolish and put downe the continuall sacrifice; and what other thing is that but the Masse, say they. See now how our subtle aduersaries haue entangled themselves; for how can Christ be euer with his Church in the sacrifice of the Masse, when the sacrifice it selfe of the Masse (by their owne confession) shall bee abolished by Antichrist for the space of three yeares and six moneths?

Turrian cap. 2.
tract. de Missa.
Vega de Missa.
lib. 5. 46.

Thirdly, I demand whether that *Inge sacrificium*, dayly sacrifice be meant properly or Metaphorically? if properly, then the sacrifice of the Masse is Iudaicall; then ought it to bee offered onely in one place, and that every day, morning and euening, which our Romish Priests obserue not. If Metaphorically, why then doe they vrge the verity and reality of a Hylasticke or Propitiatory sacrifice? or why doe wee not agree and consent that it is Propitiatory by resemblance?

Lastly, if Antichrist shall abolish the sacrifice of the Masse for the space of three years and six months, then I demand, how shal there remaine in the Church of Rome a continuall and constant succession neuer to bee interrupted? Seeing by their owne confessions, hee shall make interruption both of sacrifice and Priesthood.

Herein are our aduersaries contrary to themselves,

as

as they are alwayes contrary to the truth.

Diuers other arguments are alleadged by them, but these are the principall; and seeing their strongest testimonies are so infirme and weake, I thinke it wil be supervacaneous and vnnecessary to trouble my selfe in giuing answer to those which are more trifling, hauing the lesse pretence and shew of reason.

Wherefore thus much shall serue for the third part of this confutation, namely the answering of their obiections.

Argument. 1.

The fourth and last part now followes, wherein wee shall lay downe arguments sufficiently proouing our owne opinion, that in the Masse there is not a true reall Propitiatory sacrifice for the sinnes of the quicke and the dead, and therefore not lawfull to be vsed in the Church of God. And this is prooued.

First, that sacrifice which is al-mighty, al-sufficient, and absolutely perfect, in respect of the desired end cannot be reiterated by men; But the sacrifice of the the immaculate Lambe Iesus Christ vpon the crosse was almighty, al-sufficient, and absolutely perfect in respect of the desired end which is the saluation of the faithfull. *Ergo.* The al-sufficient and perfect sacrifice of Christ cannot be reiterated in the Masse.

The *Maior* is confirmed by the words of the Apostle, *The law which had a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can neuer, with those sacrifices which they offered yeare by yeare continually,*

usually, make the commers thereunto perfect; for then, should they not haue ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged, should haue had no more conscience of sinnes. What doth the Apostle conclude here? He opposeth the Gospell to the law; our Soueraigne Priest Christ Iesus, against the Priests of *Aaron*; his sacrifice which had no need to be renewed, against their sacrifices repeated euery day; the holinesse and effectuall sanctifying power which was in his sacrifice, against their weakenesse and disability to sanctifie. Hereupon he concludeth, *Hee taketh away the former to establish the latter*, the sacrifices of the law, to establish his owne sacrifice.

Verse 9.

Now how could this conclusion be good, if this sacrifice should be reiterated? seeing the often repetition argues weakenesse and impotency: therefore the Apostle so often vses these words *once offered*, to note the al-sufficiency of Christs sacrifice in the single and vnrepeated act of offering; hee hauing annihilated, and disanulled all other sacrifices whatsoever.

Wherefore the blood of Christ shed personally by himselfe, being of sufficient vertue and merit to purifie, cleanse, and redeeme all beleeuers, it must necessarily follow, that there needes no reiteration, but we may content our selues with that onely sacrifice offered vpon the crosse.

The *Minor* is so plaine and Orthodoxe that hee deserues not the name of a Christian that shall deny it.

Argument. 2.

Secondly, he that offereth a true Propitiatory sacrifice

V

crifice for sinne must be of more value then the sacrifice it selfe; but the Priest is not of more value then the body of Christ. *Ergo*, the Priest in the Masse cannot offer the body of Christ.

The *Maior* is true for the gift is not accepted for it selfe, but for the worthinesse of him that offers it, as *Irenæus* affirmes; wherefore albeit *Cains* sacrifice was not of lesse worth in it selfe then *Abells*, yet the person of *Cain* being vnworthy, because of the wickednesse of his heart, his offering was reiected, but *Abell* being more worthy then his oblation in regard of his faith, the Lord had respect vnto him and to his offering; so Christ as Priest was God and man, and therefore of more merit and efficacy then his humane nature which was the onely sacrifice; for without the merit of the Godhead by which the humanity was offered, the sacrifice of Christ could not haue bene of infinite value and desert.

Wherefore he that presumes to offer the body of Christ truly and really vnto God the Father for a Propitiatory sacrifice for sinne; blasphemously sayes in effect, that he is of more value, worth and merit, then the sacrifice he offers.

Argument. 3.

Thirdly, every lawfull sacrifice is grounded vpon expresse words of Scripture, whereby it may appeare that God hath instituted such a sacrifice: but there is no command in scripture for the sacrifice of the Masse. *Ergo*. The sacrifice of the Masse is not lawfull.

The *Maior* proposition is prooued by the words of Christ,

Christ, *In vaine doe they worship me, teaching for do-
ctrines the commandements of men.* Where our Sa-
uour sharply reprehendeth the Scribes and Pharises
for teaching those things to belong to the worship of
God, which were of their owne inuention, and not
by Gods expresse command; for this is a true The-
sis. *Nothing ought to bee accounted of the substance or
essence of Gods worship, but what God himselfe hath ex-
pressly commanded in his word.* And for this very thing
did God reprocue the Iewes; because they worshipp-
ed in Tophet, offering such kind of sacrifices as hee
neuer appointed; for *I spake not vnto your fathers, nor
commanded them in the day that I brought them forth of
Egypt concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices; but
this I said commanding them, Obey my voyce, and I will
be your God, &c.*

Math. 23. 9.

Ier. 7. 30, 31.
Verse 22. 23.

Where first God condemned them for doing what
they were not commanded, as offering their children
vnto *Molech* in the vally of *Tophet*.

Secondly, God shewes them wherein he will bee
worshipped, namely in that which he expressly com-
mandeth.

Therefore albeit God had commanded the sacred
action of sacrificing as a part of diuine worship, yet
because the Gentils in their sacrifices did not follow
the prescript forme of the law of God, therefore were
their sacrifices abominable, and no other then Ido-
latrous.

The *Minor* proposition is perspicuous; for let all
the Gospels and writings of the Apostles bee strictly
suruayed, and there can neither the name, nor sacrifice
of the Masse be found; for the sacrifices of the law had

their precept and prescript forme enioyned; why then if God would haue an externall sacrifice to remaine vnder the Gospell, hath hee not left vs directions for the manner? And whereas our aduersaries pretend a command in these words *Do this*; hereunto we haue already answered page 56.

Wherefore the sacrifice of the Masse hauing no ground in the new Testament, wee must needs account it fictitious, a humane inuention, and therefore to be reiected.

Argument. 4.

Fourthly, that sacrifice wherein there is no shedding of blood cannot bee Propitiatory. But in the Masse there is no shedding of blood. *Ergo*, the sacrifice of the Masse is no Propitiatory sacrifice.

The *Maior* proposition is grounded vpon the words of the Apostle, *without blood shedding there can be no remission of sinnes*; and in the legall sacrifices, all that were Propitiatory were living creatures, which were slaine by the Priests.

The *minor* is true according to the common consent of our aduersaries, who make the Masse to be *sacrificium inuictum*, an vnbloody sacrifice, and albeit the blood of Christ be powred out, yet it is not shed for them, in behalfe of whom it is offered, wherein they doe directly contradict themselues.

Argument. 5.

Fifthly, that doctrine which is contrary to it selfe is

not to be embraced in the Church. But the doctrine of our aduersaryes touching the sacrifice of the Masse is contrary to it selfe. *Ergo*, it is not to bee imbraced.

The *Major* neither Protestant nor Papist will deny.

The *Minor* is prooued.

For our aduersaries teach that the body of Christ in the Masse is an externall sacrifice, and is truly offered vnto God the Father vnder the formes of bread and wine. And yet they teach the body of Christ to be inuisible in the sacrifice; wherein they are contrary to themselues; for no externall sacrifice is an inuisible sacrifice; neither can a sacrifice be visible (which they affirme of their sacrifice) when the thing offered is inuisible.

Wherefore if they will make it an externall offering, the sacrifice it selfe must be visible, but here is nothing visible (according to their Tenent) but the Altar, the Priest his ceremoniall and mimicall actions, his many hundred crossings, the accidents and outward formes; which are no part of the sacrifice. Here then their doctrine implyes a contradiction to make it a visible sacrifice, and yet the sacrifice is inuisible, it is an externall oblation, yet the matter offered is internall and cannot be discerned. Howsoever though no man can perceiue the matter of their sacrifice, yet every man may perceiue the manner of their iugling.

Argument. 6.

Sixtly, if the sacrifice of Christ was perfectly finished

shed vpon the Crosse, then is it vnlawfull for any Priest to presume to offer againe this sacrifice. But the offering of the sacrifice of Christ was perfectly finished vpon the crosse. *Ergo*, it is vnlawfull to presume to offer this sacrifice againe in the Masse.

The consequence is euident. For hee that goes about to offer that sacrifice which was perfectly finished vpon the crosse, cannot but by his reiteration preiudice, and call in question the perfection thereof; for as *Chrysostome* speaketh, he that hath a soueraigne medicine, which by once applying is perfectly able to cure a disease, and shall often apply the same, doth derogate from the vertue thereof: so he that shall reiterate the all-sauing sacrifice vpon the crosse, by the frequent reiteration, charges it with impotency, and imbecility.

Wherefore whatsoeuer pretence our aduersaries may vse, they by their Massing sacrifice, doe no lesse then robbe the al-sufficient sacrifice of the Crosse, and with irreligious blasphemy derogate from it, the meritorious power to saue all that beleeue.

Ioh 19.30.

The *Minor* is manifest by the words of our Sauiour, he cryed *Consummatum est, It is finished*. What is finished? The Ceremoniall law was abrogated; the Morall law was fulfilled; the sacrifice of Christ was perfected; the saluation of mankind accomplished. And God forbid that against so many euidences of scripture any man should affirme the sacrifice of Christ vpon the crosse not to be perfectly finished; as though he had left any part to bee supplied by the Masse-Priests, which hee himselfe was not able to effect.

Where.

Wherefore if Christ hath on his crosse cancelled the hand writing which was against vs; if hee by his crosse hath reconciled vs vnto his father; if he on the crosse did once sacrifice himselfe for all beleeuers, then God forbid any man should reioyce in ought *save the crosse of Christ*, God forbid any Christian should seeke for a Propitiatory sacrifice in the Eucharist, which hath no vertue in it to procure pardon for sinne vnto any soule; but onely faithfully receiued to seale the remission purchased by the bloody sacrifice of Christ vpon the crosse.

But our subtile Antagonists thinke to auoide the force of our argument by this cunning distinction; There is say they two degrees of remission of sinnes.

*Sadeul. aduers.
miss. sacrif. c. 3.*

The first that God would for his part, and as much as in him lyes, be reconciled to men.

Secondly, that he would receiue them into fauour, they working by faith and repentance.

The first degree (say they) is in the sacrifice of Christs death on the crosse.

The second is in the sacrifice of the Masse; and for the confirmation of this distinction they adduce the saying of the Apostle, *God was in Christ reconciling the world vnto himselfe, not imputing their trespasses vnto them; and hath committed vnto vs the word of reconciliation.*

2 Cor. 5. 19.

But our aduersaries, by this distinction thinking to auoid us, haue given vs the greater aduantage. For this latter degree of remission of sinnes is nothing els but the application of the sacrifice of Christ vnto all men; as if they should say, that, then are wee made partakers of that great benefite of Christs sacrifice, when

Synod. Trid.

when we doe receiue him with a true faith. And for this end was the sacrifice of the Masse instituted :

Ut cruenti sacrificij salutaris virtus, in remissionem eorum, quæ quotidie committuntur a nobis, peccatorum applicetur; That the sauing vertue of the bloody sacrifice may be applyed vnto vs, for the remission of those sinnes which are dayly committed by vs.

From hence I conclude, that if the application of a Propitiatory sacrifice bee not the sacrifice it selfe, (for he that confounds the thing and the application of that thing, shewes but weakenesse of iudgement) and that in the Masse there is an application of the great Propitiatory sacrifice offered by Christ, it must needes follow, that in the Masse there is no Propitiatory sacrifice it selfe, true, and reall, but onely an application of the great and al-sufficient sacrifice offered by Christ. Therefore the Apostle sayes, that *God hath committed to vs (his ministers) the ministry of reconciliation.*

From which words I collect these two obseruations:

First that the Pastors of the Church of Christ are Ministers of application of Christs sacrifice; but not of sacrificing Christ himselfe.

Secondly, that this application is made not by sacrificing of Christ, (as our Romanists dreame) but by teaching, admonishing, and exhorting, with the administration of the Sacrament according to the institution of Christ.

Argument 7.

Seauenthly, if Christ be truly and really offered

in

in the Masse, then in the Masse he is really slaine: But in the Masse he is not truly and really slaine, *ergo* in the Masse Christ is not really offered.

The Consequence appears by this, that the offering of Christ, and the slaying of Christ are neuer separated in the holy Scripture: For it was not with Christ, as with the beast vnder the Law, which were first slaine and then offered vpon the Altar; but Christ, in the instant of his death was offered a sacrifice of a sweet smelling sauer to his Heauenly Father.

Let the Scriptures be examined, and iudge whether euer they speake of the Sacrifice of Christ, but thereby is meant his death. *For this he did once when he offered himselfe: How much more the blood of Christ, which by the eternall spirit offered himselfe without spot to God, So Christ was once offered to beare the sinnes of many.* These and all other places of the new Testament which speake of the offering of Christ are to be interpreted of his death: Wherefore to say *Christus oblatus est, Christ is offered*, is nothing else but to say, *Christus mortuus est, Christ is dead*, or *Christ is slaine*, Wherefore if Christ be truly and really offered in the Masse, he must be truly and really slaine.

Heb. 7. 27.
Heb. 9. 14. 28.

Our aduersaries answer. That there is a Sacramentall immolation of Christ in the Masse, because by the power and vertue of Transubstantiation the body of Christ is consecrated and made to subsist by it selfe, and the blood of Christ is consecrated and made to subsist by it selfe, and so though they are separated locally and in appearance, yet they are not separated *propter concomitantiam*; by concomitance they are both ioyned together.

By this their distinction they thinke to vp hold their Masse by which they ouer-turne it. For first, in that they say it is a Sacramentall immolation, herein they speake more truely then they are aware. wherein wee consent with them; for if it be Sacramentall it cannot be proper, reall, and externall, seeing that which is Sacramentall, is so *relative* hauing reference vnto that substance, whereof it is a shadow or resemblance. Againe, for the body and the blood to be framed seperately, and yet by concomitance not to be seperated; who heares not a contradiction in these words?

The *Minor* our aduersaries themselves confesse; they will not say Christ is slaine really and truely in the Masse, least their Priests should, become *Christochthonoi*, *Christ Killers*. Yet how can they auoid the suspition of treason against the life of Christ, when they seperate his reall body from his blood; for it is greatly to be feared that they who powre out his liuely blood, and breake his reall and substantiall body are guilty of the death of our Lord and Sauiour.

Argument. 8.

Eighly, If Christ be dayly sacrificed in the Masse, then Christ doth daily satisfie for our sinnes; but Christ doth not daily satisfie for our sinnes, *ergo* Christ is not dayly sacrificed in the Masse.

The consequence is plaine by euidence of Scripture; for wheresoeuer and whensoever Christ was to be sacrificed, it was for the satisfaction of his Fathers wrath.

wrath for sinne. who gaue himselfe a ransom for all to be testified in due time. Hee was delinered to death for our offences. who loued vs, and gaue himselfe for vs, an offering and a sacrifice to God, of a sweete smelling sauour. If when we were enemies, we were reconciled vnto God by the death of his sonne, &c. Who gaue himselfe for our sinnes, that he might deliuer vs from this present euill world. By these and diuers other places of holy Scripture, it is plainly prooued that satisfaction for our sinnes is the end of Christs sacrifice, and in naming the one: wee suppose the other.

1. Tim. 2. 6.
Rom. 4. vlt.
Eph. 5. 2.
Rom. 4. 18.
Gal. 1. 4.

The *Minor* is prooued because Christ did perfectly satisfie for the sinnes of all the elect, appeasing fully the wrath of God by his sacrifice vpon the Crosse; and now ceasing from making any further satisfaction, he onely sitting at the right hand of God, maketh intercession for vs. For to satisfie the wrath of God is, to doe that for vs which wee should haue done, and to suffer that which we had deserued, namely death; and so Christ should againe yeelde obedience to the Law, and suffer death againe; but the Apostle sayth, *Christ being once dead, dyeth no more*; neither is Almighty God so vniust, as to require satisfaction of him that hath perfectly satisfied already.

But our aduersaries say that Christ is sacrificed in the Masse to apply vnto vs the satisfaction which Christ hath giuen for vs on the Crosse. But so in applying satisfaction he makes satisfaction; for Christ cannot be sacrificed truely, but hee must truely die, and he cannot die, but to make satisfaction. Again,

if Christ ought to be sacrificed againe, that the fruite of his sacrifice may be applyed vnto vs, then ought he as well to be incarnate againe, in the wombe of the Virgin, that the fruite of his incarnation may be applied vnto vs; to die, to be buried, to rise againe, that so the fruite of his death, Sepulture, and resurrection may be applyed vnto vs.

Lastly, the application of the benefit of Christs sacrifice, by reiteration of his sacrifice is not found in Scripture. But there is a double meanes, one internal, and that is the efficacie of the Spirit of God, which powerfull applies vnto vs the vertue of Christs sacrifice; the other is external, namely, the Preaching of the word and the Sacraments, which two concurring together, beget faith in the soule, which particularly applies the benefit of Christs oblation to the beleeuer.

In a word, let them consider what *applicari*, to be applied signifies, and they shall easily perceiue that the sacrifice of Christ is applied vnto vs, when Christ is offered, not to God (as in the Masse) but to vs, as in the holy Eucharist; Christ freely giuing his body to be eaten, his blood to be drunke, and that spiritually by faith.

Argument. 9.

Ninth'y, if in the Masse Christ be offered vnto God by the Priests of Rome, then hee is not the onely Priest of the new Testament.

But Christ is the onely Priest of the New Testament.

Ergo

Ergo, he is not offered by the Priests of *Rome*, in the sacrifice of the Masse.

The consequence is true, for if there be a true and reall sacrifice in the Masse, there must needes follow a true and reall Priest-hood which offereth this sacrifice, and so Christ is not the onely Priest of the new Testament.

The *Minor* is denied by our aduersaries, but is proved by vs.

First, there is no other proper externall Priest-hood vnder the Gospell, but that which is after the order of *Melchizedech*; of which order there is no man worthy, but onely Christ, as is sufficiently declared.

And whereas our aduersaries vainely boast their Priest-hood to be after the order of *Melchizedech*, herein they are contrary to Scripture, which makes this not to be a common Priest-hood, as *Aarons* was, but personall, belonging onely vnto Christ; wherefore the Apostle sayes, that *Christ because he continueth for euer, hath [Aparabaton Hierosunen] such a* Heb. 7.24. *Priest-hood as cannot passe from one to another.* Where the Apostle plainly shewes that such as were mortal, and consequently not eternall, were vncapable of that order of *Melchizedech*; such are the Priests of *Rome*, mortall as those of *Aaron* were, and thereof vnto them cannot this Priest-hood be diuolued.

They thinke to cut vs off with this distinction: Christ is the primary or ptincipall Priest; but men may be secundary and lesse principall, by whose ministry Christ may offer himselfe vnto God. I demand then, was not Christ euen vnder the Law a Priest

Priest after the order of *Melchizedech*? and were not the Priests of *Aaron* being compared to Christ that was to come Secondary Priests? were they not therefore Types and figures of the Priest-hood of Christ? wherefore when the primary or superior Priest was come, the Priest-hood of *Aaron* vanished, and the Apostle would haue no legall Priest-hood to remaine. But where hath he substituted any other secondary Priests instead of the former? Certes the Scripture hath not appointed any.

Againe, by the same reason that the Apostle disannulles the legall Priest-hood, hath he also excluded all other externall Priest-hood vnder the Gospell, for he opposeth him that is immortall against those that are mortall, God and man, against those who are meere men: Now if the Priests of *Rome* be no freer from mortality, or fuller of deity then the Priests of *Leuy*, they are then by the same reason both excluded, for *Cui ratio & perfectum medium conclusionis conuenit, eidem ipsa conuenit conclusio*. To whom the true reason and perfect *medium* of a conclusion doth agree, to the same also the conclusion it selfe may be applied.

Againe, Christ is plainly manifested to be the only Priest of the New Testament, (and so alone able to offer the sacrifice of propitiation for our finnes,) by that figuratiue entring alone of the high Priest once a yeare into the Tabernacle.

Againe, he that offers a true propitiatory sacrifice, effectually in it selfe to procure pardon for sinne, must needes be a Mediator of the new Testament, therefore is it sayd of Christ, *But now hath hee obtained a better*

better ministry, by how much also he is made a Mediator of a better couenant. And for this cause he is the Mediatour of the new Testament, that by meanes of death, Heb. 9. 15.
&c.

By which places and the like it is euident, that hee that was to be the Priest of the new Couenant was also to be the Mediatour betweene God and man; and that there is no Mediatour but onely Christ appears by the words of Saint Paul; *For there is one God, and one Mediatour betweene God and man, the man Iesus Christ.* 1 Tim. 2. 5.

Wherefore if they say they are Priests of the new Testament, they may as well say, they are Mediatours, and if Mediators, then Redeemers of the Church.

Argument. 10.

Tenthly, if Christ in the Sacrament be giuen vnto vs to bee receiued with truth, faith, and humble reuerence, then Christ is not offered vnto his Father by the Priest in the Eucharist, much lesse in the Masse. But he is offered vnto vs in the Eucharist.

Ergo. Christ is not offered by the Priest vnto his Father.

The hypotheticall connexion appears by the nature of those things which are opposite, for the end of Christs institution of the Supper was to exhibite himselfe vnto all beleeuers Spiritually, to be receiued Sacramentally, for the sealing and confirmation of their faith; and not to bee offered vp by any mortall vnto his Father.

And whereas they obiekt that God gaue vnto the Israclites.

Israelites sacrifices which they should offer vnto God. We answer that this exception is *plaine heterogenes* of another nature; for their sacrifices were corporall and externall, ours spirituall and internall.

Math. 26. 26.
1 Cor. 10. 16.

The assumption is prooued by the words of *Christ*, *Take, eate, this is my body which is giuen for you. Taking* doth presuppose a *giuing*; it is called *The Communion of the body and blood of Christ*. That is the communicating, and distributing of the blessed body and blood of *Christ*, whereof all beleeuers in common are made partakers.

They affirme the Eucharist to be not onely a Sacrament, but also a Propitiatory sacrifice; wee deny it vpon this ground; because all expiatory sacrifices properly so called haue their complement in the most perfect and absolute sacrifice of *Christ Iesus*, which he offered himselfe vpon the crosse.

But say they, *Christ* sacrificed himselfe in the Eucharist, which appeares by these words, *Datur, frangitur, effunditur; is giuen, is broken, is powred out*; where our Sauour speakes in the present tense, and not, *shall be broken, shall be giuen, shall be powred out*.

We answer, first some of their owne writers haue denied that *Christ* offered any Propitiatory sacrifice when he instituted and distributed the Eucharist, see p. 84. And he himselfe saies that *his time was not fully come*; namely, wherein he should be offered.

Lyra. sup. Math.
26. & 1 Cor. 11.

Againe, their owne translation hath *tradetur, effundetur, shall be giuen, shall be powred out*; which *Lyra* following, doth so render, and so is it in the Canon of the Masse.

Moreouer, our Sauour might so speake not to signify

nifie a present sacrifice, but to intimate that his body was already broken, and his blood shed in Gods determination, and his owne resolution, in which sense he is called, *Agnus ab origine mundi occisus*, The lambe slaine from the beginning of the world, because God had appointed him from the beginning to be the Sauiour of the world. And why might not Christ speake in the present tense, hauing respect vnto their faith, whose property is to make things past, and to come to be truly present.

Canon Masse.

But the direct answer is, that in the words of Christ there is an *Enallage temporis*, the present time being set for the future; and this kind of speech is frequent in the scripture: as, *Woe vnto that man by whom the Sonne of man is betrayed; for shall be betrayed. Vnto vs a sonne and borne of, &c.*

Math. 26. 24.
Esay 9. 6.

And thus their owne Cardinall expounds it, saying. *Euangelista in voce presentis effunditur; & Paulus in frangitur, futuram in cruce effusionem & carnis fructionem significant, &c.* The Euangelists in the word (is poured out) being of the present tense; and Paul by the word (is broken) did signifie the future effusion of his blood, and the breaking of his flesh vpon the crosse. And so Gregory de Valentia vpon these words [This is my body which is given for you] saith, That is, which shall be offered by mee slaine vpon the crosse. So Hugo Cardinall vpon Math. 26. Freyn, id est, frangendum in cruce signauit, He brake (that is) he signified it to be broken vpon the crosse.

Caietan in 1.
Cor. 11.

Greg. de Valen.
Iesuit. lib. 2. de
sacr. Masse. c. 3.
Hug. Cardinall.
in Math. 26.

Now who sees not the blasphemie of our peruerse aduersaries, who against the light of holy scripture, and (I thinke I may safely say against the light of

Heb. 9. 28.

their owne conscience, dare affirme that Christ in the Lords Supper offered his transubstantiated body vn- to his Father an expiatory sacrifice for the finnes of the elect, how can they reconcile this doctrine, and the words of the Apostle, *Christ offered himselfe once for all*? which they can neuer effect, till they prooue the action which Christ performed in the night before he was betrayed to bee *eadem numero*, the same indiuiduall action which hee did the day following; for if hee offered himselfe for sinne in the Sacrament, and offered himselfe for the same sins vpon the crosse; How can this bee true, *Hee offered himselfe once for all*? who sees not by their doctrine a double offering of Christ? Who perceiues not double dealing in the matter?

Argument. II.

The eleuenth argument. That sacrifice which is not of diuine institution is not lawfull in the Church. But the sacrifice of the Masse is not of diuine institution.

Therefore the sacrifice of the Masse is not lawfull.

The *Maioy* is prooued by the confession of their owne Iesuite, who sayes that *the Church cannot institute any new sacrifice or sacrament*; for the ordinance of such essentiall parts of Gods worship must bee of diuine institution; (and as he affirmeth *Eccl. 7.*) *Sacrificia veteris legis omnia fuerunt a Deo immediate instituta, licet erant a Mose promulgata; Sacrificij autem noue legis solus Christus Deus & homo auctor est.* God was the author of all the sacrifices of the old Law, albeit they

Sacr. Iesuit.
10m. 3. d. 74.
Jest. 4.

they were promulgated by Moses: and Christ God and Man is the authour of the sacrifice of the new Testament. Therefore hath Salomon their Ieluite iustly taxed a Great Scholler of their owne Church, for saying, the Church had authority to institute a new sacrifice if Christ himselfe had instituted none.

Salmer. Iesuit.
tom. 9. tract. 18.
pag. 219.

The Minor is true; for as Martin Luther exacteth of our aduersaries a demonstration of their sacrifice from the institution of Christ, wherein (as hee obserueth) we reade that Christ did distribute this sacrament vnto his disciples, but that he offered it vp in forme of a sacrifice we cannot find.

Hereunto their Cardinall Bellarmine answereth, That this manner of argument from scripture negatively (as thus it is not expressely set downe in scripture. Ergo it was not done) is ridiculous among schoole-boyes.

Bellar. l. 1. de
missac. 24.

But if he wold take the aduise of Suarez, or stand to his owne answer, which elsewhere he himselfe hath deliuered, he would not so slightly reject that forme of arguing.

For first Suarez a Iesuite of his owne society, that hee might proue the receiuing of the bread and the wine in the Eucharist not to bee any essentiall part of this sacrifice reasoneth negatiuely from Christ his institution thus: It is very likely that Christ instituting this sacrifice did not make it of the essence of this sacrifice for the Priest to reteine, for the Euangelists negative authority proues it; it being probable that they relating the history of so great a mystery would not haue pretermitted so essentiall a rite thereof; who doe expressely signifie that Christ did consecrate the Eucharist, but that hee himselfe did take it they doe not report; and immediately hee addes,

Suar. Iesuit.
tom. 3. dist. 75.
sect. 5. pag. 971.

addes, *If the Priests receiving of the bread and wine be of the essence of the Eucharist, it ought to have bin cleerly and plainly delivered by the Euangelist.*

From hence may bee collected thus much. That whosoever is not expressely related by the Euangelist concerning the institution of this sacrament is not essentiall or absolutely necessary thereunto.

This is *Snarez* his confession, and as much as *Luther* and we desire, for, if the Euangelists haue not layde downe any institution of a sacrifice, nor so much as named a sacrifice in the Eucharist, wee ought not to embrace it; this therefore argues the malice of our aduersary *Bellarmino*, who calls this a ridiculous manner of reasoning in vs, which is vsed by a Doctour of his owne order not inferiour to himselfe in learning and iudgement.

Secondly, let vs appeale vnto the iudgement of the Cardinall himselfe, who answers in another case after the same manner, for hee reciteth the *Liturgies* that passe vnder the name of Saint *Iames*, because all things (saith he) contained in those *Liturgies*, and in the *liturgies* of other Fathers, are not taken from the example or precept of Christ.

*Bellar. de Euch.
l. 4. c. 13.*

Thus doth the Cardinalls argument frame it selfe whatsoeuer in the seruice of God is not by prescript precept, or direct example of Christ confirmed, is not lawfull or warrantable; see now the partiality and philautia of the Cardinall; for what hee thinkes commendable in himselfe, he accounts ridiculous in another.

The Liturgie of Saint *Iames* is not lawfull, because it contains many things not taken either from the example

ample or commandement of Christ, yet we may not say, that the Masse is vnlawfull because it cannot be prooued by either example or commandement of Christ. Note here the Cardinall requires greater authority for the confirmation of a Liturgy then of their Massing sacrifice.

Wherefore, when they vrge the lawfulnessse of this their sacrifice, let vs reply Orthodoxally in the Cardinals owne words, *Shew vs either example or commandement from Christ, and it shall suffice.*

For in this tempestuous night of opposition and contention, wee haue nothing to steere our course by, but by the compasse of Scripture, and the Load-starre Christ, in whom wee are to obserue *dicta & facta*, his words and his actions in his institution.

It is not vnttrue that some Romanists haue thought that Christ did name the word sacrifice or oblation when he spake vnto his father, albeit it be not mentioned by the Euangelist, for they thought it necessary in consecration that Christ should haue vsed the words offering or sacrificing. But that had beene strange forgetfulnessse in the Euangelists to haue omitted, the maine thing which must authorize this sacrifice; and how did the *spirit of the truth*, lead them into all truth, if this were omitted which is the maine part of Gods seruice, and the chiefe solace of a Christian soule?

But we will not tie them to so strict a taske as to finde in the institution of Christ, the very words of a sacrifice or oblation; it shall auaille them to proue any word tending to that purpose. Bellarmine brags

*Suar. Iesuit. tom
13. d. sp. 57. sect.
2. p. 902.*

Bella. l. i. de mis-
sa cap. 12.

of the probate of the point, and vseth this argument. *Christ offered himselfe vnder the forme of bread and wine vnto his father, and bid his Apostles do this in remembrance of him, therefore the Church may offer a sacrifice propitiatory according to Christs command, laying, Do this.*

Who sees not here a Paralogisme, or *petitio principij*? For he takes that for granted, which is the life of the cause; and hee supposes that Christ offered himselfe vnder the formes of bread and wine, which can neuer be proued, and therefore is vnlikely to be granted by vs, for if it can appeare that Christ at the institution of the Eucharist or Lords Supper did transubstantiate his body into the bread and wine, and so did offer it vnto his father, wee shall soone yeelde, and the controuersie shall haue end. But can any man beleeue that *Christ* carried his whole body in owne of his hands? that he gaue it to be eaten to his Disciples, which saw him present at the Table, and heard him speaking to them, both while they were eating him, and afterward? that the same sonne of man should at once both deuoure his owne body and sit intire and whole at Table? That a true naturall body should be in many places at once? Vnlesse, hee were as *Tursellian* reports of St. *Xavier* one of *Loyala's* brood, who was seene in a boate and ship both at once, like *Plantus* his *Amphitruo*.

Tursellian.

Iul. Scal. exer.
in Cordan.

Scaliger layes downe his Axiome, *The numerickall vinity of a finite thing cannot stand without continuity.* But *Bellarmino* sayth, *The very places, wherein Christ body is, are discontinued; yea, and the very body of Christ it selfe, is diuided from it selfe in respect of place*

place, though not in respect of substance and quantity. As though there could be any diuision of a materiall substance, but by bounds of place; or as if quantity were not both bounded and measured by place alone: Or as if that finite body, which is in two places at once, were not first diuided in it selfe.

So that we demaund of Bellarmine, as once Paul did in another case, *Is Christ diuided?* The Papists do not say as once of old, *Behold here is Christ, or there:* but which is much worse, *Behold Christ is both here and there, and euery where, in his true humane nature;* thus they blush not to teach impossibilities, that the selfe same body should be all here, and all not here; all visible and all inuisible; all vppon the Table, and all in Heauen; all eaten and all vneaten; all in England and all at Rome.

1 Cor. 1. 13.

Who sees not these impostures to be most palpable? And for that Bellarmine will haue these words *Do this,* to signifie as much as to sacrifice, thereby to establish their great *Diana*, the sacrifice of the Masse, hee alleadgeth not one of the whole Catalogue of the Fathers who hath so interpreted those words: Infomuch that his brother Cardinall disparaging of the prooffe of the Masse, by these words is faine to confesse: *¶ Vt vel hoc ex loco, vel alijs scriptura locis efficaciter probari non possit, hoc esse sacrificium: tamen ex ecclesie traditione id efficaciter probatur.* That albeit this sacrifice cannot be proued by this text, *Do this,* or by other places of Scripture; yet it is effectually proued by the tradition of the Church. Which may make vs iustly admire the vaine pretences of our aduersaries,

Bell. lib. 1. de missa. c. 12.

Transen. concor. c. 131. pag. 904.

aduersaries, who boasting of nothing more then Scripture, are yet faine wholly to relinquish it, and to build vpon the tradition of the Church; but an answer vnto this see afore.

And for these words, (*Is giuen, broken, shed for you.*) they interpret to be a present giuing in the Eucharist by way of sacrifice; but this is sufficiently answered in the former Argument.

Now seeing the words of Christs institution doe make their sacrifice to be a meere *non Ens*, let ve examine his actions, and see if any of them will breath any life into this their sacrifice. The actions of Christ the Scripture mentions to be foure, *Hee cooke bread, He blessed it, He brake it, He gaue it.* Not any one of these can seeme to import a sacrifice. And whereas our aduersaries haue divided their sacrifice into six actions, in the which of them, this sacrifice should consist, *Suarez* makes it doubtfull.

*Suar. l. 1. tom. 3.
a. sp. 75. sect. 2.*

*Suar. ibidem:
Bellar. de missa.
l. 1. c. 27.*

The first action is the taking of the bread, before consecration and the heauing it vp which they call the Eleuation of the host; this is not essentiall to the sacrifice by the Iesuites owne confession, *because it cannot be prooued neither by Scripture nor the tradition of the Church that Christ did vse it.* Albeit herein he dissents from *Sotus* a learned Doctor who with others thought it to be vsed by Christ, and in some sort to be'ong to the substance of this sacrifice.

Suar. ibidem 64.

The second action is the Consecration of the Host in the words of Christ, *Hoc est corpus meum, This is my body.* This *Suarez* iudges to be intrinsecall and essentiall to this sacrifice, and to be the sacrificing action; and yet tels vs that it was the opinion of many

nifie a present sacrifice, but to intimate that his body was already broken, and his blood shed in Gods determination, and his owne resolution, in which sense he is called, *Agnus ab origine mundi occisus*, The lambe slaine from the beginning of the world, because God had appointed him from the beginning to be the Sauiour of the world. And why might not Christ speake in the present tense, hauing respect vnto their faith, whose property is to make things past, and to come to be truly present.

Canon Masse.

But the direct answer is, that in the words of Christ there is an *Enallage temporis*, the present time being set for the future; and this kind of speech is frequent in the scripture: as, *vnto that man by whom the Sonne of man is betrayed; for shall be betrayed. Vnto vs a sonne and borne of, &c.*

Math. 26. 24.
Esay 9. 6.

And thus their owne Cardinall expounds it, saying. *Euangelista in voce presentis effunditur; & Paulus in frangitur, futuram in cruce effusionem & carnis fructionem significarunt, &c.* The Euangelists in the word (is poured out) being of the present tense; and Paul by the word (is broken) did signifie the future effusion of his blood, and the breaking of his flesh vpon the crosse. And so Gregory de Valentia vpon these words [This is my body which is giuen for you] saith, That is, which shall be offered by mee slaine vpon the crosse. So Hugo Cardinales vpon Math. 26. *Fregit, id est, frangendum in cruce signauit*, He brake (that is) he signified it to be broken vpon the crosse.

Caietan in 1.
Cor. 11.

Greg. de Valen.
Iesuit. lib. 2. de
sac. Masse. c. 3.
Hug. Cardinal.
in Math. 26.

Now who sees not the blasphemie of our peruerse aduersaries, who against the light of holy scripture, and (I thinke I may safely say against the light of
Y their

Heb. 9.28.

their owne conscience, dare affirme that Christ in the Lords Supper offered his transubstantiated body vn- to his Father an expiatory sacrifice for the finnes of the elect, how can they reconcile this doctrine, and the words of the Apostle, *Christ offered himselfe once for all?* which they can neuer effect, till they prooue the action which Christ performed in the night before he was betrayed to bee *eodem numero*, the same indiuiduall action which hee did the day following; for if hee offered himselfe for sinne in the Sacrament, and offered himselfe for the same sins vpon the crosse; How can this bee true, *Hee offered himselfe once for all?* who sees not by their doctrine a double offering of Christ? Who perceiues not double dealing in the matter?

Argument.

The eleuenth argument. That sacrifice which is not of diuine institution is not lawfull in the Church. But the sacrifice of the Masse is not of diuine institution.

Therefore the sacrifice of the Masse is not lawfull. The *Major* is prouued by the confession of their owne Iesuite, who sayes that *the Church cannot institute any new sacrifice or sacrament*; for the ordinance of such essentiall parts of Gods worship must bee of diuine institution; (and as he affirmeth *scilicet* 7.) *Sacrificia veteris legis omnia fuerunt a Deo immediate instituta, licet erant a Moysse promulgata; Sacrificij autem noui legis solus Christus Deus & homo author est.* God was the author of all the sacrifices of the old Law, albeit they

Suar. Iesuit.

tom. 3. disp. 74.

scilicet 7.

they were promulgated by Moses: and Christ God and Man is the authour of the sacrifice of the new Testament. Therefore hath Salomon their Iesuite iustly taxed a Great Scholler of their owne Church, for saying, the Church had authority to institute a new sacrifice if Christ himselfe had instituted none.

Salmer. Iesuit.
tom. 9. tract. 18.
pag. 319.

The Minor is true; for as Martin Luther exacteth of our aduersaries a demonstration of their sacrifice from the institution of Christ, wherein (as hee obserueth) we reade that Christ did distribute this sacrament vnto his disciples, but that he offered it up in forme of a sacrifice we cannot find.

Hereunto their Cardinall Bellarmine answereth, That this manner of argument from scripture negatively (as thus it is not expressely set downe in scripture. Ergo it was not done) is ridiculous among schoole-boyes.

Bellar. l. 1. de
missac. 24.

But if he wold take the aduise of Suarez, or stand to his owne answer, which elsewhere he himselfe hath deliuered, he would not so slightly reject that forme of arguing.

For first Suarez a Iesuite of his owne society, that hee might prooue the receiuing of the bread and the wine in the Eucharist not to bee any essentiall part of this sacrifice reasoneth negatively from Christ his institution thus. It is very likely that Christ instituting this sacrifice did not make it of the essence of this sacrifice for the Priest to receiue, for the Euangelists negative authority prooues it; it being probable that they relating the history of so great a mystery would not haue pretermitted so essentiall a rite thereof; who doe expressely signifie that Christ did consecrate the Eucharist, but that hee himselfe did take it they doe not report; and immediately hee

Suar. Iesuit.
tom. 3. dist. 75.
sect. 5. pag. 971.

addes, *If the Priests receiuing of the bread and wine be of the essence of the Eucharist, it ought to haue bin cleerely and plainly deliuered by the Euangelist.*

From hence may bee collected thus much. That whosoeuer is not expressely related by the Euangelist concerning the institution of this sacrament is not essentiall or absolutely necessary thereunto.

This is *Suarez* his confession, and as much as *Luther* and we desire, for, if the Euangelists haue not layde downe any institution of a sacrifice, nor so much as named a sacrifice in the Eucharist, wee ought not to embrace it; this therefore argues the malice of our aduersary *Belarmine*, who calls this a ridiculous manner of reasoning in vs, which is vsed by a Doctour of his owne order not interiour to himselfe in learning and iudgement.

*Bellar. de Euch.
l. 4. c. 13.*

Secondly, let vs appeale vnto the iudgement of the Cardinall himselfe, who answers in another case after the same manner; for hee reciteth the *Liturgies* that passe vnder the name of Saint *James*, because *all things* (saith he) *contained in those liturgies, and in the liturgies of other Fathers, are not taken from the example or precept of Christ.*

Thus doth the Cardinalls argument frame it selfe: whatsoeuer in the seruice of God is not by prescript precept, or direct example of Christ confirmed, is not lawfull or warrantable; see now the partiality and philautia of the Cardinall; for what hee thinkes commendable in himselfe, he accounts ridiculous in another.

The Liturgie of Saint *James* is not lawfull, because it contains many things not taken either from the example:

ample or commandement of Christ, yet we may not say, that the Masse is vnlawfull because it cannot be prooued by either example or commandement of Christ. Note here the Cardinall requires greater authority for the confirmation of a Liturgy then of their Massing sacrifice.

Wherefore, when they vrge the lawfulnessse of this their sacrifice, let vs reply Orthodoxally in the Cardinals owne words, *Shew vs either example or commandement from Christ, and it shall suffice.*

For in this tempestuous night of opposition and contention, wee haue nothing to steere our course by, but by the compasse of Scripture, and the Load-starre Christ, in whom wee are to obserue *dicta & facta*, his words and his actions in his institution.

It is not vnttrue that some Romanists haue thought that Christ did name the word sacrifice or oblation when he spake vnto his father, albeit it be not mentioned by the Euangelist, for they thought it necessary in consecration that Christ should haue vsed the words offering or sacrificing. But that had beene strange forgetfulnessse in the Euangelists to haue omitted, the maine thing which must authorize this sacrifice, and how did the *spirit of the truth*, lead *them into all truth*, if this were omitted which is the maine part of Gods seruice, and the chiefe solace of a Christian soule?

But we will not tie them to so strict a taske as to finde in the institution of Christ, the very words of a sacrifice or oblation; it shall auaille them to proue any word tending to that purpose. Bellarmine brags
of:

Bella. l. 1. de mis-
sa cap. 12.

of the probato of the point, and vseth this argu-
ment. Christ offered himselfe vnder the forme of
bread and wine vnto his father, and bid his Apostles
do this in remembrance of him, therefore the Church
may offer a sacrifice propitiatory according to Christs
command, laying, Do this.

Who sees not here a Paralogisme, or petitio prin-
cipij? For he takes that for granted, which is the life
of the cause; and hee supposes that Christ offered
himselfe vnder the formes of bread and wine, which
can neuer be proued, and therefore is vnlikely to be
granted by vs, for if it can appeare that Christ at
the institution of the Eucharist or Lords Supper did
transubstantiate his body into the bread and wine,
and so did offer it vnto his father, wee shall soone
yeelde, and the controuersie shall haue end. But can
any man beleue that Christ carried his whole body in
owne of his hands? that he gaue it to be eaten to his
Disciples, which saw him present at the Table, and
heard him speaking to them, both while they were
eating him, and afterward? that the same sonne of
man should at once both deuoure his owne body and
sit intire and whole at Table? That a true naturall
body should be in many places at once? Valesse, hee
were as Turfellian reports of St. Xanier one of Loy-
ala's brood, who was seene in a boate and ship both
at once, like Plantar his Amphitruo.

Turfellian.

Jul. Scal. exer.
in Cordan.

Scaliger layes downe his Axiome, The numerical
unity of a finite thing cannot stand without continuity.
But Bellarmine sayth, The very places, wherein Christs
body is, are discontinued; yea, and the very body of
Christ it selfe, is diuided from it selfe in respect of
place

place, though not in respect of substance and quantity. As though there could be any division of a material substance, but by bounds of place, or as if quantity were not both bounded and measured by place alone. Or as if that finite body, which is in two places at once, were not first divided in it selfe.

So that we demaund of Bellarmine, as once Paul did in another case, *Is Christ divided?* The Papists do not say as once of old, *Behold here is Christ, on there;* but which is much worse, *Behold Christ is both here and there, and every where, in his true humane nature;* thus they blush not to teach impossibilities, that the selfe same body should be all here, and all not here; all visible and all invisible, all vpon the Table, and all in Heauen; all eaten and all vneaten; all in England and all at Rome.

Who sees not these impostures to be most palpable? And for that Bellarmine will haue these words *Do this*, to signifie as much as to sacrifice, thereby to establish their great *Diens*, the sacrifice of the Masse; hee adudgeth not one of the whole Catalogue of the Fathers who hath so interpreted those words. In so much that his brother Cardinall despairing of the prooffe of the Masse, by these words is faine to confesse: *Vi vel hoc ex loca, vel alijs scripture locis efficaciter probare non possu, hoc esse sacrificium: tamen ex ecclesie traditione id efficaciter probatur.* That albeit this sacrifice cannot be proued by this text, *Do this*, or by other places of Scripture; yet it is effectually proued by the tradition of the Church. Which may make vs iustly admire the vaine pretences of our aduersaries,

1 Cor. 1. 13.

Bell. lib. 1. de missa. c. 12.

Transen. concor. 6. 131. pag. 904.

aduersaries, who boasting of nothing more then Scripture, are yet faine wholly to relinquish it, and to build vpon the tradition of the Church; but an answer vnto this see afore.

And for these words, (*Is giuen, broken, shed for you.*) they interpret to be a present giuing in the Eucharist by way of sacrifice; but this is sufficiently answered in the former Argument.

Now seeing the words of Christs institution doe make their sacrifice to be a meere *non Ens*, let vs examine his actions, and see if any of them will breath any life into this their sacrifice. The actions of Christ the Scripture mentions to be foure, *Hee tooke bread, He blessed it, He brake it, He gaue it.* Not any one of these can seeme to import a sacrifice. And whereas our aduersaries haue diuided their sacrifice into six actions, in the which of them, this sacrifice should consist, *Suarez* makes it doubtfull.

*Suar. l. 1. tom. 3.
c. 75. sect. 2.*

*Suar. ibidem:
Bellar. de missa.
l. 1. c. 27.*

The first action is the taking of the bread, before consecration and the heauing it vp which they call the Eleuation of the host; this is not essentiall to the sacrifice by the Iesuites owne confession, *because it cannot be prooued neither by Scripture nor the tradition of the Church that Christ did vse it.* Albeit herein he dissents from *Sotus* a learned Doctor who with others thought it to be vsed by Christ, and in some sort to be'ong to the substance of this sacrifice.

Suar. ibidem 64.

The second action is the Consecration of the Host in the words of Christ, *Hoc est corpus meum, This is my body.* This *Suarez* iudges to be intrinsecall and essentiall to this sacrifice, and to be the sacrificing action; and yet tels vs that it was the opinion of ma-
ny

ny learned men, That consecration was but only an antecedent unto the sacrifice, but properly neither so be of the essence, nor yet any part of this sacrifice. And how can the Papists confidently build upon sacrifice upon those words, *This is my body*? when their owne Bishop hath proved from the testimonies of the most ancient Fathers, that those are not the words of consecration; but that the words of consecration were before those words, when Christ prayed and blessed the bread, and the cup; and therefore hee alledgeth the perpetuall practise of the Church, from the age of the Apostles whose custome was to consecrate by prayer or benediction; as also the Liturgies of *St. James, Clement, Basil, Chrysostome*, do declare the same, being backed with the iudgement of many learned Schoole-men, to whom hee adioynes the *Diuites of Colein*, all agreeing consecration rather to be in the prayer or blessing of Christ, then in these words, *This is my body*; which hee rather accounts to be the Institution then the consecration of the Sacrament.

Ibidem.

Episc. Casariensis
tracta. v.
de necess. cor-
rect. Theolog.
scholasti. l. i. c. 5.
See Bishop Mar-
ton Protest. ap-
peale. l. 2. c. 2,
§ 21. p. 117.

The third action after the words of consecration is the Oblation vsed by the lifting vp of the Host, in these words, *Remissum, Eleva, &c.* Concerning which, there is great contention; some great Doctors have placed the whole essence of this sacrifice in this Oblation or Eleuation as *Ecebius, Clitonius, Ruarden*. Others say, it is of the essence, but not the whole essence, as *Soto, Gabriel Biel, Soto, Cano*: these *Suarez* quoteth but differing from them all, for he affirms it to be no essentiall part of the sacrifice, with whom agrees *Bellarmino*, because say they, it is not

Suarez. tom. 3. disp.
75. sect. 3. p. 964
Bellar. de missa
l. 1. c. ult.

expressed in the Scripture, neither yet is it probable
other wayes; that this kinde of elevation, or lifting
vp was vsed by Christ in the institution; onely here-
in these Iesuites differ: *Suarez* will haue this eleua-
tion to be an Ecclesiasticall rite, but *Bellarmino* to be
Apostolicall.

Suar. ibidem.

The fourth action is the dipping of the consecra-
ted Host into the cup; which *Canus* makes to bee of
the substance of this sacrifice; which *Suarez* againe
one the same ground disanulls, because that it ap-
peares not that Christ did vse any such action.

Suar. ibid. sect.

2.3.

Protestants ap-
peale 1.2.c.7.

sect. 11. num. 41.

The fifth action is the distribution of the sacrament
according vnto the example of Christ, who gaue it
vnto his Disciples: which (saith the Iesuite) some
Catholike Doctours haue iudged to be the full com-
plement and perfection of this sacrifice. But (as lear-
ned *Morton* obserues) first they must shew vnto
vs where the essence of this sacrifice is to bee found,
least they tell vs of the perfection of a sacrifice before
their sacrifice appeare to be *Ens*, or to haue any be-
ing.

Suar. ibidem.

dist. 75. sect. 5.

Bellarmino 1.2.c.7.

tract. 29. p. 223.

The last action is the Priests consuming the conse-
crated formes by eating and drinking; some make
this to be the substance of the sacrifice and the very es-
sence of it; as the Moderne *Thomists*, *Lessius*, *Ca-
nus*, and *Bellarmino*; who are againe contradicted by
other great Doctours of the Roman Church, as *Tho-
mas Aquinas*, *Bonaventure*, *Maier*, *Alain*, *Cassalius*, *Ca-
sbarinus Turrianus*, *Palacius*; with whom *Salmeron*
doth consent: all which doe deny that this consump-
tion of the Host doth belong to the essence of this
sacrifice.

Thus haue you seene what cruell warre our aduersaries doe maintaine among themselves: Ephraim against Manasses, and Manasses against Ephraim, but both against Iudah. Intestine war in their owne campe, yet they all conspire against the truth.

Now let the Reader iudge, where is vniity or consent in doctrine, when their greatest Doctours in the maine point of religion, are at variance directly contradicting one another with, *est & non est, it is and it is not.*

They vniustly vpbraide vs with dissensions, when alas ours is no dissension if compared with theirs, we onely differing in the fringe, they in the garment, wee alone in the ceremonies, they in the substance and very soule of religion.

Thus haue we largely and sufficiently prooued by the testimonies of our aduersaries that the sacrifice of the Mass was not instituted by *Christ*, and therefore (by the confession of their owne Jesuites) not to be admitted into the Church.

Argument. 12.

The twelfth argument is grounded vpon Bellarmine's owne Assertion, which is this: *Ad verum sacrificium requiritur ut quod offertur Deo in sacrificium plane destruat, id est, non mutetur ut definet esse quod erat.* To a true sacrifice is required, that that which is offered vnto God in sacrifice be wholly destroyed: that is, be so changed, that it cease to be that which it was.

And againe, *Verum & reale sacrificium verum & realem mortuam destructionem rei immolatæ desiderat.*

Suarez and
Bellar.
Bellar. l. 1. de
missa. c. 2. § 11.

L. 1. de missa
cap. vii.

172
*rat. A true and proper sacrifice requireth a true and re-
all death or destruction of the thing sacrificed.*

Which assertion is true in all Propitiatory sacrific-
es, wherein there was alwayes a destruction of the
offering or sacrifice, and that by death and shedding
of bloods that by them they might bee perfect. As
of the great sacrifice of Christ vpon the crosse, where-
in his body did shed blood, suffered death, sustained
destruction, though not totall and perpetuall, yet par-
tiall and for a season, in so much, that although hee
was not consumed, yet there was in him for a time a
cessation or ceasing to bee a living man as hee was
before.

Our aduersarie then hauing vouchsafed vs this
ground worke, we will make bold thus to build vpon
it.

Euery thing really and properly sacrificed for pro-
pitiation doth suffer a real destruction of the substance;
But the body of Christ doth not in the sacrifice of the
Masse suffer a real destruction.

Ergo. In the sacrifice of the Masse the body of
Christ is not really and properly offered.

The *Mayor* being graunted by the Cardinall, the
Minor prooues it selfe thus.

If the body of Christ doth in the Masse suffer destru-
ction (which to say were blasphemy) it must eyther
be in whole or in part; if in whole, how came we to
finde the same Christ, the same body and blood the
next morning againe in the Masse? If but in part, or
for a time (as it was during his being in the graue)
then would follow that the Church for a time hath no
Christ perfect God and perfect man.

Now

Now Bellarmine affirms that the Priest's eating of the consecrated elements (which are made the body of Christ) is the destruction of the sacrifice; his words are these, *Consumptio per manducatio, non fit a sacerdoti quod sit essentialis, sed per accidens, in eo probatur, quia in tota actione missae nulla est alia realis destructio victimae praeter ipsam requiritur, ut in realem destruatorem supra probatum est, The Priest's consumption or eating of the Host is proved to be of the essence of the sacrifice; for in the whole action of the Masse there is no destruction of the sacrifice but only this; and that there must be a real destruction of the sacrifice I have already proved.*

Bellar. de missa.
l. 1. c. ult. prop. 7.

But herein how is he constant to himselfe, who says, *The substance of the sacrifice must suffer destruction*: and yet hold againe, that the Priest consumes not the body of Christ by eating it, for it suffers no diminution, but only the formes of bread and wine.

Who sees not here a most palpable contradiction? for he will have the body of Christ to be the substance of this sacrifice, and this substance must be consumed, or els it is no sacrifice; and yet when it comes to the point, the body of Christ suffers not destruction but only the formes. Is not this to make *quidlibet* a sacrificer? Is not this to make it a sacrifice and no sacrificer? Is not this to say the body of Christ is the substance of this oblation and not the substance, because it is not consumed?

Again, if a Propitiatory sacrifice be as Bellarmine defines it: *That which doth pacify the wrath of God for the remission of sinnes.*

I demand then how remission of sinnes is procured?

Heb. 9. 22. .
 animae chus
 apo tou haimatos
 & chusin.

ted? Paul says it cannot be obtained *choris haimate-
 chusis, without blood-shedding*. But how shed? even
 as the word signifieth, *by pouring is out of his body*.
 But doth the blood in their sacrifice goe out of his
 body?

Bellarmino answers no; therefore is it called *an vn-
 bloody sacrifice*.

From our Adversaries owne definition then, may
 we confute this their sacrifice; as the Master in the
 Gospell, *ex ore tuo, out of thine mouth will I condemn
 thee oh evil servant*.

Bellarmino affirms a Propitiatory sacrifice is to ob-
 taine remission of sinnes; but no remission without
 reall and actuall blood-shedding; In the Masse (by
 the confession of our Antagonists) there is no reall or
 actuall effusion.

Ergo, no remission.

Ergo, no Propitiatory sacrifice.

Ergo, the doctrine of the Romane Church herein
 is false.

But stay. Let vs not be so seuer in pronouncing the
 sentence of iudgement against them: let vs heare
 what they can answer for themselves. Let *Gregory de
 Valentia* speake for them all; his words are these. *Disti-
 nctur, Christus sacramentaliter in Eucharistia immolatus;
 non quia mors representatur illius, sed quia ex vi ver-
 borum consecrationis seperatim solum corpus, & solum
 sanguis conficitur; quo ipso verè sanguine corpus sepe-
 raretur, atque adeo funderetur sanguis è corpore, nisi ali-
 unde fieret, ut & sanguis corpus, & corpus sanguinem
 coniunctione indissolubili comitteretur, quoniam Christus
 iam non moritur. we say that Christ is sacrificed in the
 Eucharist*

*Greg. valen. l. 1.
 de missa. c. 14.
 pag. 587. col. 1.*

Eucharist sacramentally, not because his death is there represented, but because by the vertue of the words of consecration, his body alone, and his blood alone are made apart, and seprately; whereby also his body would be truly seuered from his blood, and his blood poured out of his body, but that otherwise his blood by an indissoluble coniunction must accompany his body, and his body his blood; for Christ in the Eucharist ayes not.

Thus from one absurdity they runne into a thousand.

First, he sayes Christ is sacramentally sacrificed; which is improper, for that there is a maine difference betweene a sacrifice and a sacrament.

In the first we offer vnto God.

In the second God vnto vs.

Neither can a sacrament and a sacrifice be predicated of one thing, but only *kat allo, kai allo* in diuers respects; wherefore to ioine these two is an incongruity in the nature of those things; we deny not but Christ is mystically, figuratiuely, or representatiuely sacrificed in the Eucharist, but not *quatenus est sacramentum, & ex ratione*; as it is a sacrament, or in that respect.

Secondly, he sayes, Christ is sacramentally sacrificed in the Eucharist, but least we should take hold of his words, he further explains himselfe, saying, not because his death is there represented.

Hereby giuing vs to wit, that hee meanes not any bare representation of Christs death, but that actually, really, and true'y his death is before vs. Wee say not that in the Eucharist or Lords Supper, there is a bare representation of his death; but besides the sacramentall

mentall presence of the Lords body and blood there is a true, reall, and actuall application of his death (*quoad meritum*, in regard of the merit of it) to all that receive with faith. But the Iesuite will haue a proper death of Christ in the Eucharist, euen as he is truly, really, substantially and corporally present; and yet see how he thwartes and crosses himselfe in the last words, saying, *Christ in the Eucharist dyes not.*

Hence we may frame this Argument. After the same manner that Christ is in the Eucharist, after the same manner hee dyes in the same [for an actuall and corporall presence requires an actuall and corporall death as a sacramentall presence, a sacramentall death onely] But in the Eucharist (by our aduersaries owne confession) Christ dyes not properly, actually, or bodily.

Ergo, in the Eucharist, hee is not properly, actually, or bodily present.

Thirdly, note how contrary this doctrine is vnto it selfe. The body of *Christ* (saith he) and the blood of *Christ* are consecrated apart and severally, yet they do not subsist apart, least there should be an actuall, and reall effusion of the blood of *Christ*.

But I demand, if it be so that they are consecrated and made apart, then when the Priest hath consecrated the body of *Christ* first (for hee cannot consecrate both in an instant) doth not that body subsist without blood, till hee hath made and consecrated the blood also? This is strange in the sacrament that the body of *Christ* and his blood should admit for a time, such an actuall separation as is betweene that which hath a being, and that which hath no being.

Lastly,

Lastly, note how enigmatically he tells vs of those things which are separated by consecration, and yet are indiuisibly conioyned, that they cannot be separated; contrary to the institution of Christ, who tooke the bread, and the cup seuerally, consecrating them asunder, to figure vnto vs that actuall and reall separation of the body and blood of Christ vpon the crosse.

Argument. 13.

The thirteenth Argument is this. That which is a Propitiatory sacrifice for sinne, must appease and pacifie the wrath of God (this *Bellarmino* affirmeth.) But the sacrifice of the Masse doth not appease the wrath of God.

Bellar. de missa, l. 2. c. 1.

Ergo, The sacrifice of the Masse is not Propitiatory.

The *Minor* is thus prooued.

That which doth appease Gods wrath must bee of infinite value. But the sacrifice of the Masse is not of infinite value.

Ergo, The sacrifice of the Masse cannot appease Gods wrath.

The *Mayor* is prooued: because the wrath of God for sinne being infinite, cannot be pacified but by that which is of infinite merite and desert, and this is confessed by their owne Iesuite in these words, *Si Aaron, aut nullus Pontifex, hostiam obtulisset, quæ vi sua tolleretur peccata, non esset necesse alteram offerri, quia iam peccata per illam deleta erant. Dices, illa hostia debebat peccata usque ad illam oblationem commissa, sed quum postea committerentur noua peccata, quid obstat alteram offerri? frustra id fieret, nam si virtute sua tollebat peccata,*

Ribera Ies. com. in Heb. 10. num. 19. in hac verba. Alia qui cessasset offerri

in finiti valoris erat, non enim aliter poterat tolli peccatum & compensari iniuria Deo facta. If Aaron, or any other high Priest had offered a sacrifice, which by it owne vertue had taken away sinne, there had beene no need to haue offered any more, because all sinnes were already taken away by the former. Thou wilt say that sacrifice did take away those sinnes which were committed before it was offered, but when afterward new sinnes were committed, why may not new sacrifices be offered? No, that were but in vaine, for if by it owne proper vertue it did take away sinnes, it was then of infinite value and merit, for otherwise sinne could not bee taken away, nor the iniury done vnto God recompenced.

First, here he disableth the Leuiticall sacrifices, because of their often repetition and reiteration.

Secondly, he propoues our *Maioꝝ Proposition*, that nothing can appease the infinite wrath of God, and so satisfie his iustice, but that which is of infinit merit and desert; therefore all the Angells in heauen could not haue wrought mans redemption by satisfying for the sinne of Adam, but Christ himsele: nor he, had he been meere man and not *Theanthropos*, God and man, for no finite creature can bee of infinite desert before God; wherefore it was necessary that the Deitie of Christ should giue efficacie, vertue, and desert vnto the humanity by the Hypostaticall vnion: which desert should be infinite, euen as the Godhead of Christ was.

The *Minor* appeares that the sacrifice of the Masse is not of infinite value or desert, by the testimony of our great aduersary *Bellarmino*, whose words be these,

*Bellar. de missa,
l. 2. c. 4. sect.
Quarta propos.*

Valor sacrificij Missae est finitus; hac est communis sententia.

sentia Theologorum, & probatur apertissime ex vsa Ecclesie; nam si Missa valor infinitus esset, frustra multe missae, praesertim ad rem eandem, offerrentur: si enim infiniti valoris est, certe ad omnia impetranda sufficeret, quorsum igitur aliae. Et confirmatur ex sacrificio crucis, quod ideo non repetitur, quia illud unum infiniti valoris fuit, & pretium acquisiuit pro omnibus peccatis praeteritis & futuris remittendis; The vertue of the sacrifice of the Masse is finite; this is the common opinion of Divines; and it is prooued plainly by the vse of the Church, for if the vertue or value of the Masse were infinite, it were in vaine to offer many Masses, especially for one thing; and if it were of infinite value, surely it would be sufficient to procure pardon for all sinnes, and then what needes any more Masses. And it is confirmed by the sacrifice of the crosse, which is not reiterated, because that it alone was of infinite valour or merit, and procured satisfaction for all our sinnes past, and to come. In these words, the Cardinall pleades our cause; for herein I note especially two things.

First, that the often repetition of the sacrifice of the Masse, argues that it is but of finite value and merit.

Secondly, that the sacrifice of Christ vpon the crosse, was onely of infinite value, desert, and merite to make satisfaction, and to procure pardon for all sinnes past and to come.

Wee may demand then in the Cardinalls owne words, *Quorsum igitur missae?* What need haue we of Masses? Seeing Christ hath accomplished our redemption by offering himselfe once for all.

But whence proceedes this insufficiencie of the Masse?

masse? if it be the same body, and consequently the same sacrifice (as they teach) how hath it lost its vertue, that it should not be infinite in the Masse, as well as on the crosse? *Bellarmino* alleadgeth three reasons hereof, but so weake and infirme, as can no way be seeme a man of so great learning.

Bellar. de missa.
l. 2. c. 4.

The first is taken from the sacrifice it selfe which is offered; for in the sacrifice of the crosse the very naturall being of Christ in his humane body was destroyed; but in the sacrifice of the Masse, the sacramentall being of Christ onely is destroyed. But this hee affirmeth himselfe to be no cause why the one should be finite and the other infinite.

The second is taken from the person offering; for in the sacrifice of the crosse, the person offering is the Sonne of God immediately by himselfe; but in the sacrifice of the Masse, the person offering, is the Sonne of God, by the hand of the Priest. As though a mortall man could by his infirmity disable the sacrifice of Christ, and diminish the extent of that infinite oblation.

The third reason is taken from the will of Christ; for albeit he could by one oblation obtaine all things of God for all men, yet he would not, but the benefits of his passion, should bee obtained in a certaine measure; and if any man desire a reason hereof, it is not for vs curiously to search into it, but his will is a sufficient reason.

These grounds, alas, how weake are they for a Christian to build his faith vpon? How shall a man bee established by such tottering foundations?

As touching diuers other most materiall points of Religion, so also concerning this, our grand Captaines of Rome are together by the eares, and in open hostility against one another: *Caietane*, *Canus*, *Soto*, these defend the vertue and valour of the sacrifice of the Masse to be infinite: on the other side contend *Thomas Aquinas*, *Durandus*, *Maier*, *Gabriel*, with whom *Bellarmino* takes part, confidently maintaining the vertue, merit, and desert of the sacrifice of the Masse to be absolutely finite in it selfe.

Caiet. q. 79. art. 5. & tom. 2. Opus. tract. 3. q. 2. Canus loc. Theo. l. 12. c. 19. Soto in 4. dist. 11. q. 2. Thom. in 4. dist. 3. 45.

Argument 14.

The foureteenth Argument is taken from the end of a propitiatory sacrifice, and it is thus framed. A true propitiatory sacrifice doth procure remission of finnes.

But the sacrifice of the Masse doth not procure remission of finnes.

Ergo, The sacrifice of the Masse, is no true propitiatory sacrifice.

The *Maier* is by *Bellarmino* himselfe affirmed, in his definition of a Propitiatory sacrifice, *Propitiatorium est, cuius finis prater Dei cultum, est iras Dei propitiatio, & peccatorum remissio*. Where he makes the end of a propitiatory sacrifice next vnto Gods glory, to be the appeasing of Gods wrath, and the remission of finnes. And vnto this the typicall sacrifices of propitiation in the ceremoniall Law had respect; for thereby, through faith in the Messiah, who was the Antitype, they hoped for condonation, and were assured of remission of finnes.

Bellar. l. 2. de missa c. 3.

The first proposition, then hauing the common consent of all men, we must proue our assumption. Which our Romanists thinke a Herculean worke. *Hic labor, hoc opus est.*

As Suarez relateth tom. 3. disp. 79. sect. 3. Referente Cano loc. Theolog. l. 12. Greg. Val. les. de missa l. 1. c. 5. Canus loc. Theol. l. 12.

Now to proue the sacrifice of the Masse, not to be auailable to procure the pardon of sinne, we alledge first the testimonies of our aduersaries, that so there owne tongues may fall vpon them, as the Psalmist speakes of the enemies of Gods Church. Some of the Church of Rome maintained that, *The sacrifices of the Masse by vertue of the deede done, did immediatly conferre the infusion of habituall grace.* Others directly affirmed the contrary, some hold the obtaining of this grace to be infallible. Others againe, that it is vncertaine, as Durand, Canus, Corduba. Some maintaine it to be auailable for the remission of mortall finnes. Others, to be auailable onely for the remission of veniall finnes, (as Gregory of Valentia reporteth) which (say they) may be pardoned without grace. Others againe are of opinion, that it is not efficacious for the pardon of any sinne, but onely, to gaine release of those punishments, the guilt whereof had beene formerly pardoned. Some thinke this is wrought by the vertue of impetration and prayer; others by the power of satisfaction and redemption. Thus is there found confusion and ciuill warres, in the Campes of our enemies, for euery mans hand is against his fellow, as once was in the army of the Midianites.

How then can this sacrifice be thought fit to be vsed in the Church, which is so lacerated and torne in peeces, by the seuerall opinions of so many Doctors

of great repute, who contend so stoutly for it?

Againe, the Apostles speakes plainly hereof, Heb. 10. 18. saying, *where remission of finnes is, there needs no more sacrifice for finnes.* But who dares deny that absolute and perfect remission of offences, was purchased vnto all beleeuers by the sacrifice of Christ offered on the crosse once for all? Our aduersaries themselves dare not, nor doe not deny it, yet will they not relinquish their sacrifice of the Masse. Heb. 10. 18.

Argument.

The fifteenth Argument. The Apostle sayes that Christ needes not to offer himselfe often, but now once in the end of the world hee hath appeared to put away sinne by the sacrifice of himselfe; and againe, By one offering he hath perfected for ever, them that are sanctified; From these testimonies of Scripture, I frame this Syllogisme; If Christ once in the end of the world was sacrificed to put away sinne; and by one offering hath perfected them that are sanctified, then he is not offered in the Masse. But Christ once in the end of the world was sacrificed to put away sinne; and by one offering of himselfe once for all hath perfected them that are sanctified. Ergo, Christ is not offered in the Masse. Heb. 9. 26. Heb. 10. 14.

Bellarmino answers, that the Apostle there speaketh of the bloody and painefull sacrifice of Christ vpon the Crosse which was sufficient once to bee done; but this taketh not away the *unbloody* sacrifice, which is but a continuance of the former, whereby the

Bellar. l. 1. c. 2. de missa.

the fruit and efficacy of the former oblation is applied vnto vs.

But wee are to obserue, that the Apostle by these words, excludes and cuts off all iterations of the sacrifice of Christ; for otherwise, if Christ should now be often sacrificed really, though after any manner, the difference of the Apostle could neuer stand, betwene the Leuiticall sacrifices which were often repeated, and the sacrifice of Christ, which was once offered.

Secondly, that is but a false distinction of a *bloody* and an *vnbloody* sacrifice, as they vnderstand it, otherwise then the fathers did; for there can be no proper vnbloody sacrifice of Christ; neither could hee be offered vp otherwise then by dying: Therefore he is not offered vp in the Eucharist because therein hee dyeth not.

Thirdly, we neede not inuent a new kind of sacrifice, which may apply vnto vs the efficacy of Christs death, seeing to that end Christ hath appointed the preaching of the word, and the administration of the Sacraments.

*Ibid. resp. ad Ar-
gum. 2.*

Bellarmino replyeth: first though the death of Christ be applied by the Preaching of the word, and administration of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; yet it may be applied also by the sacrifice of the Masse, which in this behalfe is not superfluous, no more then Baptisme is, by which also Christs death is applied. Secondly, that the Apostle speaketh of the bloody, and painefull sacrifice of Christ vpon the Crosse, it appeareth by the words following, *For then he must haue often suffered.*

But

But we cut off *Bellarmines* answere, by affirming; That albeit both the Eucharist and Baptisme doe apply the death of Christ vnto vs, yet is not Baptisme superfluous, because it is of Christs institution, so is not the Masse. Againe, they apply Christs death diuerfly; baptisme as the scale of our regeneration; the Eucharist as a signe of our redemption; the one signifies our sanctification by the washing of Christs blood; the other our iustification by the sufferings of the same Christ our Sauour; the one for our initiation into the Church; the other for our confirmation; so that neither of them are superfluous; but the sacrifice of the Masse is superfluous, because the remembrance and shewing forth of Christs death is sufficiently performed without a sacrifice. Wherefore the comparison holds not, that the Masse may as well be vsed to apply the vertue of Christs death, albeit the Eucharist doth the same, as baptisme, seeing baptisme is of Christs institution, the Masse is not; and baptisme, and the Lords Supper, though they both apply the death of Christ, yet in diuers manners, and for diuers ends.

But the Papists pretend the same to be the end of the Masse, which is of the Lords Supper.

And whereas *Bellarmino* sayth, the Apostle speaks of the bloody sacrifice of Christ, it is true, for he neuer once dreamed of an vnbloody sacrifice which could neuer haue any existence, *in rerum natura*. For if you marke the Apostles words, hee quite knockes this vnbloody sacrifice of the Papists on the head, saying, *Not that he should offer himselfe often, &c. For then must hee often haue suffered.* Intimating

Heb. 9.25.26.

that there can be no proper offering, or real sacrificing of Christ, but by death and suffering. Wherefore where there is no actual death of Christ, nor real suffering, there can be no true and proper offering; and Christ having but once died really, he could but once be really offered.

Argument. 16.

The sixteenth Argument is taken from the words of Christ, who being on the Crosse cryed out, *Consummatum est, It is finished.* Giue vs leaue to demand, what was finished? Let one of their owne friends speake. *Why, now was finished, whatsoever God had determined, whatsoever he had commanded, whatsoever the Law and the Prophets had foretold concerning Christ; whatsoever was necessary and conducible for mans saluation; the oblation was offered; the types fulfilled; the shadowes abolished, the Scriptures were verified, and the great sacrifice, [quo solo Deus placari potuit] by which onely the wrath of God was pacified, is now perfected.*

In which words observe, first, that whatsoever was necessary for mans saluation was now accomplished; what neede then haue we of Masses? Secondly, that *Ferus* sayes, *The sacrifice of Christ was finished.* How dares any man then renew it in the Masse? Thirdly, he sayes, *The sacrifice of Christ on the Crosse, onely could pacifie Gods wrath.* How then comes the sacrifice of the Masse to be propitiatory?

*Bellarmin. l. 1. c. 25.
de missa.*

Bellarmin answeres, that these words, *It is finished*, are to be vnderstood of the Prophecies of his passion, nor that all things were done necessary to mans saluation: For then the Sacraments and all Doctrine should bee superfluous. But this answer will

will not serue the turne; for the prophecies were not all fulfilled, when hee spake these words; for after this time two prophecies were fulfilled: First the *not breaking of a bone foretold*, *Exod. 12. 46.* Secondly, *the pearcing of him with a speare*, prophecied *Zach. 12. 10.* *Exod. 12. 46.*
Zach. 12. 10.

But let vs admit for good *Ferus* his wordes, *Quoniam fuit in opere consummationis, ideo dixit consummatum est*, because they were in the act of consummation, or ready to be consummated, therefore he sayd, *It is finished.* And let vs admit for good the first part of *Bellarmines* answer, that the prophecies were fulfilled; yet let vs a little pause before we grant the second.

For whereas he sayes, *All things necessary to mans salvation, were not finished*; it is true if hee meane some speciall actes which did concerne Christs person, as his resurrection, and assension, without which our redemption could not bee perfectly consummated. Againe, if he vnderstand it of some indiuiduall actions of religion, which were to be performed for the salvation of such particular persons as should beleue afterward, it is true, they were not finished, because the persons whom God had appointed, and decreed to vse as meanes for the conuersion of others, were to liue in future ages, and had not as yet beeing, and consequently could not at that time finish those acts, whereupon they were destined of God; but if he vnderstand by these words, [*All things necessary for mans salvation, are not finished*] all the specificall acts of religion, as Prayer, Preaching, Administration of the Sacraments, &c.

mentes, &c. and whatsoever of that kind which is necessary to mans saluation is not finished; this is false, for that they had their institution from Christ before his death, and so in the *species* they were finished. Or if thereby the sacrifice of Christ was not finished; this is false; for both it, and the saluation of man by it was finished; as appears by the Apostles vsing the same words, saying, *with one offering, setledoken, consummavit, he hath consummated for euer such as are sanctified.* And whereas he sayes that if all things necessary for mans saluation were consummated, then the sacraments and all doctrine should bee superfluous; this is false for the institution of them might be consummated, although the exercise of them in future ages were not finished.

Heb. 10. 14.

Againe, the perfection of Christ's sacrifice aboliseth not the vse of doctrine and Sacraments, which doe represent vnto vs the death and sacrifice of Christ, but it aboliseth all other sacrifices of Propitiation; for if they be but memorialls of Christ's death they are superfluous; the word and sacraments beeing sufficient to that end; and if they be more then memorialls, as auailable to forgive sinnes, they are blasphemous, and make Christ's sacrifice imperfect.

Argument. 17.

The seauenteenth argument is taken from the falsehood of the Canon of the Masse, and it is thus framed. Such as is the Canon, such is the sacrifice. But the Canon of the Masse is false.

Ergo, the sacrifice is false, and consequently not Propitiatory.

The

The falshood of the Masse appears in diuers things.

1. In the ancient Church when the Lords Supper was celebrated, the Christians vsed to bring their *agapai*, which were the bread and wine for the reliefe of the poore, and the maintenance of the Ministry; and when they had laide downe these oblations (which were neuer accounted a Propitiatory sacrifice) they prayed for the prosperity and preservation of the Church: which in the Canon before the consecration is applyed vnto the bread and wine, and the bread and wine is offered vnto God the Father for the happiness of the Church.

Secondly, in the Canon, They pray vnto God that he would accept that pure sacrifice of the body and blood of *Christ*, as he accepted the sacrifices of *Abell* and *Melchizedech*. In which words they become intercessours vnto God the Father to accept his Son *Iesus Christ*, as though he were not worthy to be accepted of himselfe. And how absurd is it to compare the most pretious sacrifice of the body and blood of *Christ* (if it were so really and truly) vnto the sacrifice of *Abel*, which was but a lambe or a goate.

And how vnwisely doe they pray that God would accept the sacrifice of his Sonne as hee did accept the sacrifice of *Melchizedech*, whereas it cannot appeare (as is formerly prooued) by the holy scripture, that *Melchizedech* offered bread and wine; how absurd is it then to compare the sacrifice of *Christ* with that sacrifice which neither was, is, nor shall be?

Thirdly, the Canon saith, that the Priest offereth vnto God the heauenly Father the bread of life. But where are they commanded to offer the bread of life,

seeing

seeing in the scripture there is mention made of eating the bread of life, but not of offering?

Fourthly, the Canon ouerthrowes the article of ascension; for it commands the Angells to carry that vnspotted sacrifice to the high Altar of heauen, and to present it before God the Father. What? Is not *Christ* ascended, and sitteth for euer at the right hand of God? and hath he now more need of the helpe of Angells then when he first ascended by the whole power of his Godhead? and cannot hee appeare before his Father, but by the assistants of Angells?

But let me bee bold to demand three questions of our aduersaries grounded vpon these words of the Canon, *Supplices te rogamus omnipotens Deus, iube hac perferri per manus sancti Angeli, &c.* we humbly beseech thee, O Omnipotent God; that thou wouldest command this sacrifice to be carryed by the hands of the holy Angell, vnto thy high Altar in the sight of thy diuine Majesty, &c.

Hcb. 10. 12.

First, if they vnderstand it of the bread and wine transubstantiated into the body and blood of *Christ*, how comes it to passe, that they are not taken by the Angell, and carryed immediately into heauen according to the prayer of the Church?

Secondly, I demand, if their doctrine bee true of their Multipresence, that the true humane body and blood of *Christ* be both in heauen, and in many thousand places vpon the earth at one time, what need then the Angell to carry the body of *Christ* into heauen, where it is already before his heavenly Father?

Thirdly, (if it be so as they say, that *Christ* in the night when he instituted the Lords Supper, did offer himselfe

himselfe, his naturall body and blood vnder the forms of bread and wine, a true Propitiatory sacrifice to his heavenly Father) I demand whether the Angell did carry this sacrifice into heauen, or whether it did appeare before his Father in heauen, or no? If they say no; how then was the sacrifice accepted? or how comes the Church to pray for that priuiledge, of hauing this sacrifice carryed into heauen, which was not vouch-lated to the sacrifice offered immediately by Christ himselfe? If they affirme that it was carryed into heauen, it would then follow, that *Christs* body was in heauen before his passion, resurrection, or ascension; and when he in his humane nature ascended into heauen from his Disciples, hee found his humane body and blood before his Father, and to haue beene there before it came thither.

Thus they make *Christ* to haue two bodies, and consequently two soules; and so *Christ* is not one, but two; but many; but innumerable. These absurdities doe directly result, and arise from their blasphemous Canon; which is so grosse and palpable, as deserves to be huffed out of the Church.

Lastly, the Canon in diuers places ouerturnes the Mediation of *Christ*, in that they pray to Saints and Angells making them to be intercessours; it also establishes Purgatory and prayer for the dead, doctrines so dissonant from the truth of the Scriptures, as when we see them authorized in the Church of Rome, wee may iustly call in question the vertue of their massing sacrifice.

Argument. 18.

The eighteenth Argument is taken from the effect of the Masse; thus. That which destroyeth the true nature of the Lords Supper cannot be a true Propitiatory sacrifice for the sinnes of the quicke and the dead. But the pretended sacrifice of the Masse doth subuert and destroy the nature of the Lords Supper.

Ergo, the pretended sacrifice of the Masse is not Propitiatory for the sinnes of the quicke and the dead.

The *Maior* is not denyed by our aduersaries.

The *Minor* is thus prooued. *Augustine* saith, *Sacramentum est visibile signum inuisibilis gratie*; a visible signe of inuisible grace; so that in euery sacrament there is *signum & signatum*, the signe and the thing signified, both which abide whole and intire, in such sort as it is not possible that the one can be the other, or any part of the other. But the sacrifice of the Masse destroyeth the nature of a sacrament, for it taketh away the substance of the bread, which is the signe and seale of his body; it taketh away the substance of the wine, which is the symbole of his blood; and that by changing and altering them, as some of them hold, or els by annihilating them, as others say; or by reducing them into their first matter; from substances into accidents, contrary vnto all nature, yea contrary to the things signified; for there ought to be resemblance betweene the signe and the thing signified; as *Manna* did represent the bread of life which came downe from heauen; in baptisme, water which washeth

eth away corporall spottes, the blood of Christ which cleanseth our spirituall pollutions; bread and wine which nourish our naturall life, the body and blood of Christ, which sustaine and feede vs vnto eternall life. But roundnesse, whitenesse, moistnesse, and rednesse, which they giue vs for signes, what analogy or proportion haue they with our spirituall nourishment? These accidents of bread and wine haue no power or vertue to feede the body, but the substance of bread and wine; they leaue those, and take away this; where then is the sacrament when the signe is abolished.

Againe, the sacrifice of the Masse taketh away the thing signified in the Lords Supper. Whats that? It is the body and blood of Christ, yea Christ himselfe. For the very body and blood of Christ was giuen only for them which beleue in him and abide in him; for them (saith the Apostle) which dwell in him by faith, and in whose hearts he dwelleth: for them (saith Saint Augustine) which are his members; and therefore the same Father saith a man may eat panem Domini, the bread of the Lord; and yet not eat panem Delictum, the Lord the bread, making a difference betweene the bread in the sacrament, and that life-giuing bread which is Christ himselfe represented by the symboles in the Eucharist. But oh what iniury is offered by the Papists in their sacrifice vnto the body and blood of Christ, which is the food of eternall life, when dogs and Iwine, that is reprobates and hypocrites shall bee made partakers of it; nay, and these *ex opere operato*, by vertue of the very act of receiuing doe merit remission of finnes and relaxation of punishment; nay a

Orig. in Mat.
cap. XL

Aug. tract. 26. in
Iohan. & De
civi. dei. l. 21.
c. 25.

Mouse, or a Dog may eate the precious body of our Lord Iesus Christ (which doth so perplex their greatest Doctors, that if it be demanded; whether if a Dog or a Mouse doe eate the consecrated Host, they doe eate the very body of Christ: they are at a non plus, and know not what to answer). Wee affirme and dare iustifie; That the signe of the Sacrament may be received of all that are of competent age in the Church; But, *Res Sacramenti*, the thing signified in the Sacrament, can onely be received by the faithfull, which are rightly of the Church: for, so saith Origen; Of this true and verie meate of this word made flesh, no wicked or ungodly man can eate, because it is the word and Bread of life: because hee that eateth of this bread liueth for ever. And S. Augustine speakes plainly to this purpose, saying; The Signes are common to the good and euill, but the thing proper to the faithfull alone: therefore the Apostles did eate, *Panem Dominum*, The bread which was the Lord; but Iudas onely, *Panem Domini*, the Bread of the Lord, against the Lord. Doth not this take away Christ himselfe, when the Church shall giue vnto wicked men, and vnbeleeuers, and they themselves shall receive the very substantiall Body of Christ. Again, they destroy the humanity of Christ, for the which, the Fathers of the Church haue so mightily contended against diuers Heretikes: for, when without warrant of Gods word, they ascribe vnto this body, a property of being in a thousand places at once, how do they not destroy the nature of a true Humane body, which can be but in one place at one time? as is proued, Aug. 198. Nay, doth not this Sa-

crifice

erifice make Christ a dead Christ, in that they doe really separate his body from his blood, making them in consecration, and after consecration, to subsist a part; which separation was the very death of Christ?

And whereas Christ saith; *I am with you unto the end of the world.* And; *where two or three are gathered together in my name, I will be in the midst of them.* These, and the like speeches, are to be vnderstood of the Diuinitie of Christ, which filleth all places: as these Speeches; *You shall not haue me alwaies with you; It is expedient for you, that I goe away. The heauens must containe him, untill the restoration of all things,* are to be vnderstood of his Humanity, which is circumscriptiuely, onely in one place at once. And so the Fathers vnderstand these places. Origen saith; *It is not the man which is every where; where two or three be gathered together in his name; Or, yet is alwaies with us untill the end of the world; Or, which is in every place where the faithfull are assembled; but, it is the Diuine power which is in Iesus.* And so Saint Augustine; *[You haue the poore alwaies with you, &c.]* Let not good men be troubled, in respect of his maiestie, providence, grace, &c. It is fulfilled which he said; *I am alwaies with you.* In respect of the flesh, which the word tooke vpon it, it is the same which is said; *You shall not haue me alwaies.* The Church enioyed him but a few daies, in respect of his bodily presence; but, now it possesseth him by faith, and seeth him no more with these bodily eyes, &c. And in another place, vpon these words; *Vado, & venio ad vos.* He went as men, he staid behind: as God: He went, in as much as he was but in one place; he staid and abode still, in as much as hee

Deus. dicitur
in eo. et
omnis
locus. dicitur
habere
eum.

Orig. in Mat.
Tract. 33.

Aug. in Iohan.
tract. 50.

In Iohan. tract.
78.

De verb. Dom.
Ser. 60. & de
tempor. Ser. 40.

was euery where. By which words of S. Augustine it appeares, that hee conceiued the Humane body of Christ to reside in one place, and not to bee in many places at once. And in another of his writings hee hath these words; [*It is expedient for you that I goe.*] Although that hee be alwaies with vs by his Diuinitie; but, if he had not gone away from vs corporally, we should haue seen him daily with these carnall eyes, and should neuer haue beleueed in him spirituallly, &c. And for this cause he hath absented himself in body fro al the Church, to the end, that faith may be edified and builded up.

Cyr. Alex. in Ioh.
L. 9. c. 21. & L. 10
c. 39.

Lib. de incarn.
c. 21.

Vigil. L. 1. cont.
Eut. ch.

Bed in hom.
pesh.

And to this purpose, S. Cyrill. It is meete, that all the faithfull beleue, that howsoeuer our Lord be absent in body, yet he is present by his power to all them that loue him, &c. And reciprocally, no man doubtieth, seeing hee ascended into heauen, that hee is absent in the flesh, though present in the spirit. What is it then? I will not leaue you comfortlesse; that is, how that after he is ascended into heauen, he is in vs by his Spirit. And againe; He is absent according to his Humanity; but present according to his Diuinitie. Vigilius, Bishop of Trent, dissenteth not from the former, saying; The Sonne of God had a beginning, as concerning the nature of his flesh; but, he had not any, if you consider the nature of his Diuinitie; in regard of that, he is a creature, but in regard of this the Creator: in respect of that, hee is a subiect to be contained in one place; but, in respect of this it is not possible for him to be contained in any place. And this is the Catholike faith, & confession, which the Apostles haue deliuered vnto vs, &c. Bede saith; Christ ascending vp into heauen, after the resurrection, left his Disciples corporally, howbeit, the presence of his Diuine Maiesie

Maieſty did neuer leave them. I will conclude theſe
teſtimonies with the ſaying of Bernard; I goe from you,
ſaith the Lord, according to my humanitie; but, I doe not
goe away from you according to my Diuinitie: I leave
you with my corporall preſence, but I aide and aſſiſt you
with the preſence of my Spirit.

Bern. Ser. 19.
de can. dem.

But, it may be ſaid, that the body of Chriſt, be-
ing now a glorified body, may bee in diuers places at
once. No, ſo long as the humanity of Chriſt conti-
nues to bee a Creature, ſo long is it limited to one
place. Theodoret ſpeakes to this purpoſe; It is glori-
fied with diuine grace, adored of the ceſtiall powres;
but notwithstanding, a body, ſubiect to that limitation
that it was before. And Auguſtine ſaith; The Lord is
on high, but the Lord which is verity and truth (that is
to ſay, in as much as he is God) is here alſo: it muſt needs
be, that the bodie wherein he roſe againe, ſhould conti-
nue in one place, altho' that his truth be diſperſed abroad
euery where. With whom doth conſent Gregory Na-
zianzen; we teach the ſame Chriſt, conſiſting of a cir-
cumſcriptible bodie, and of an incircumſcriptible ſpirit;
of a body which may be contained in a place; and a ſpi-
rit which no place is able to containe. Now, againſt ſuch

Aug. de diuer.
queſt. q. 83.

Greg. Nazian.
ad Theod. dial. 1

a cloud of witneſſes, with one conſent agreeing, that
the body of Chriſt is finite, and ſo limited to one
place, and cannot be in many places at once; doth
the Church of Rome conteſt, to maintaine this their
Sacrifice, like the Vbiquitaries in ancient times, who
would haue the body of Chriſt to fill all places.

Obiection

But, they obiect, That Chriſt is God, and there-
fore omnipotent, and conſequently can do all things;
Why then, can he not make his body to exiſt in ma-
ny places at once? I anſwer; *A poſſe ad velle non va-*
let

Answer.

Aug. de trin.
l. 15. c. 14.

Thom. 1. p. Sum.
q. 25. art. 3. & 4.
& aduers. Gen-
til. l. 1. c. 4.

let consequentia; Christ will not doe all he can. And yet, I thinke, I may bee bold to say, that Christ as God, cannot doe all things, not that this implies any weaknesse in Christ; for, not to be able to doe some things, argues his perfection; as, Christ cannot lye, cannot deceiue, cannot sinne; for, so saies S. Augustine; If God could doe these things, it were an imbecillitie, and want of power in him; for, great is the power of the word, in that it cannot lye; for that, therein cannot bee any contradiction, as, it is, and it is not. Nay, some things in the creature God cannot doe, for, as Aquinas speakes; God is not Almighty, in respect of the things wherein there is contradiction, because they cannot be accounted of as possible things; as, he cannot make an unreasonable man; nor, a Triangle without three angles, & their lines. For, this is to make a thing, to be, and not to be. Neither can he (as I suppose) make a naturall body without quantitie, or quantitie without dimensions; or, that which hath dimension, to be in diuers places at once, and yet to remaine entire in both places; for, that were to make a contradiction true, that the whole body of Christ should be here, and the whole body of Christ should not be here.

Wherefore, when the Papists ascribe vnto the body of Christ, multipresence, or, vertue to be in a thousand places at one instant, what is this, but to suppose an impossibility, and to take from the natural properties of a true humane body: and thus, as they destroy the signe in the Sacrament, so by their sacrifice doe they subuert the very substance of the thing signified.

Argument. 19.

The last Argument is taken from the vncertainty of this Sacrifice, and is thus framed; That which is a true propitiatory Sacrifice for sinne, giues assurance vnto him for whom it is offered, of remission of his sinne. But, the Sacrifice of the Masse giues not assurance of remission of sinne:

Ergo, The Sacrifice of the Masse, is not propitiatory.

The *Minor* is thus proued; That which dependeth not vpon the institution of the Sacrament, nor vpon the sacramentall words (as the Papists terme them,) but, vpon the intention of the Priest, can giue no assurance of remission: For, if the Priest intend not with his minde, albeit he speaketh the words with his mouth, yet (according to their owne doctrine) he consecrateth not, and so the body of Christ is not really in the Sacrament, and consequently, it cannot be a proper Sacrifice.

And thus they tye the grace of God, not to his institution, accompanied with his holy Spirit; but, to the intention of the consecrating Priest; and the Son of God shall not be ours, that is, the life which is in him shall not distribute it selfe vnto the faithfull, further then the discretion of this intention shal extend. And it shall be in the power of the Priest to frustrate, and send away empty, a whole Assembly of Christians, gathered together with desire to receiue saluation by this Sacrifice. Yea, howsoeuer the people are apt to depart without any benefit to their soules; for, if the

Rom. 14. 23.

the intention of the Priest be not to consecrate, or that in the act of consecration his minde bee otherwise busied in thinking of other matters, then the body of Christ are not vnder the formes of Bread and Wine; neither is it a reall Sacrifice. And neuertheless, if he doe consecrate, yet the people do not communicate therein, because they are not assured of the Priests intention, and therefore cannot be assured of the Reall presence of the body of Christ. Now, where there is not assurance in the communicating, there can be no comfortable, or sauing receiuing, but rather sinfull, for so S. Paul saies; *whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.* And they themselues are of iudgment that he receiues not the body of Christ, who doth not beleue that he receiues it: like Magick charms, where in strong imagination and beleefe workes the effect.

And yet obserue here, how contrary againe they are vnto themselues, when they teach; that, *Opus operatum, The worke wrought, is sufficient to merit.* What difference then is between the godly and the wicked? Or, what priuiledge hath the righteous more then the prophane? seeing both good and bad receiue the same consecrated Christ; performe the same worke of communicating? And for all men (that can pay well) without difference is the Sacrifice of the Masse offered.

Or, what comfort can the Laity of the Roman Church find in the Sacrament, when that which shold giue life to their faith, breedeth in them nothing but doubting, and vncertainty? seeing, that after they haue prepared themselues, they know not what they receiue, because they are not assured of the intention of

of the consecration.

But here I demand of the Romanists; If the consecration of the body and blood of *Christ* depend vpon the intention of the Priest, so that if he intend not in the act of consecration, the Body of *Christ* is not then present, neither is the Bread or Wine transubstantiated. How then can the Doctors of the Church of Rome free the people from the sinne of Idolatry, which worships the creature in stead of the Creator, the vnconsecrated Elements, in stead of the true and substantiall Body and Blood of *Christ*? For, they worship the bread, supposing it to be the Body of *Christ*, when, through either the negligence, or wilfulness of the Priest, in not intending consecration, it remains in its owne proper substance.

They thinke to salve this sore with a nice distinction, they tell vs it is materiall Idolatry, but not for-mall; as though Idolatry, masked vnder a countrey were not a sinne: and, because it is not voluntarie, or intentionall, therefore it were tollerable.

The Idolatry of *Spain* was neuer so grosse, as to worship any graven Images in stead of God; but (as our Papists plead) to worship God, in or through their Images: yet, this prouoked God vnto ialousie, and drew downe his vengeance vpon these Idolaters. Is not this more palpable Idolatry, where the Bread and Wine, which are but creatures, are worshipped with *Latria*, adoration which the Scriptures ascribe vnto God alone? And so manifest, that they a scallbe vnay this Sacrifice, the same glorious worship which they ascribe vnto God, hee bar the Church of Rome to examine the last generall Council held by the Church

Concil. Triden.
c. 5. de Euch.
cap. 6.

of Rome, namely, the Councell of Trent, where he shall finde this blasphemous Canon: *Si quis dixerit in sacramento Eucharistie Sacramento, Christum unigenitum Dei filium non esse cultum sicut etiam externa adorandum, venerandum, neque processibus secundum laudabilem & universalem Ecclesie sancte ritum & consuetudinem & solemniter circumferendum vel non publicè adoratur populo proponendum, & eius adoratio esse idololatras. Anathema sit.* If any man shall say that Christ, the only begotten Sonne of God, is not to be adored with external divine worship in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, and that it is not solemnly to be carried about in procession according to the laudable and universall rites and customs of holy Church, and that it is not publickly to be shewed to the people that they may adore it, and that the worshippers thereof are idolaters: let him be anathematized. And in the beginning of the same Chapter there are these words. *Nullo modo que debemus locum relinquere cum omnis Christi fidelis, pro more in Catholica Ecclesia semper receptum sit, ut cultus, quo vultus debetur, huius sanctissimi sacramenti in devotione adhibeatur.* There is now no place of doubting left seeing all the faithfull of Christ according to the customs which were always received in adoration bring due unto this sacred sacrament that most worshipful adoration which in holding is the same God. This is a doctrine of Devils, commanding most abominable idolatry, also by that to be contradicted under paine of his Holiness curse. But let us admit that Christ is to be worshipped in the Eucharist, yet how can this participation be the same of Idolatry, when as be the Priest in this invocation, and consequently

ly consecrate not, yet they worship the bread and wine with adoration.

But I will not here enter into the discussion of this point, whether the Eucharist is to be adored with Diuine worship? Least I should too much enlarge this Treatise, which hath already transcended the dimites of my intention.

Thus having sufficiently satisfied (as I hope) the indifferent and impartial Reader, concerning the propounded parts of this controuersie, as namely, that the pretended sacrifice of the Masse hath no ground in the Doctrine of the Scriptures, practise of the Apostles, or writings of the ancient Fathers, as secondly touching the originall encrease and continuance of the Masse: Thirdly, of the imbecillity and weakenesse of their objected Arguments: Lastly, of the firme and solide grounds of our dislike and opposition. I shall in fine lay before the eyes of all men a briebe enumeration of all the impieties and blasphemies of this abominable Idoll, and so shall conclude all with a serious dissuasion, from all, or any participation in that superstitious worship.

The Impietyes of this Sacrifice are these.

First, it is not onely diuers from the institution of Christ, but quite overthrowes it, as appeares by these particulars. 1. First, Christ instituted a Sacrament wherein he freely offereth himselfe to be receiued of all beleeuers, by faith, and to bee eaten spiritually. They turne it into a sacrifice, which is offered vnto God the Father, not being distributed to the people, but deuoured by the Priest, and that substantially, really, and materially: So that whereas the

Church should haue bene thankfull for that God hath giuen his onely sonne for her saluation, shee strives to make God her debtor by offering vnto him a sacrifice, but such a sacrifice as he neuer desired, expected or commanded. 2. Christ in the Sacrament consecrated bread, and wine, which remained as signes, and symboles of the body and blood of Christ. In the Masse they consecrate the real and substantiall body of Christ, taking away the Sacrament in that they take away the signes. 3. In the Sacrament, the vertue and efficacy is in the power of God, making it operative by the grace of the Spirit. In the Masse the deede done deserves pardon, and the Priest hath a portion of remission of sinnes, which may bee bestowed on whom he will. 4. The Sacrament is onely profitable for the liuing, but the Masse for the quicke and the dead. 5. The Sacrament was instituted to manifest the Communion of Saints, therefore called the Communion figured by the bread framed of many cornes, and made into one loafe, and the wine made of many grapes, so all beleevers are one body, but in priuate Masse, the Priest consumes all the host himselfe, as though hee alone had right vnto Christ, the Layty gazing on him appearing rather to be excommunicate persons, then to haue any communion in the body of Christ, as also the Communion of Saints is abolished by the Masse, seeing any notorious sinner, who can pay for a Masse, shall haue as much relaxation of paines, as a righteous man. 16. In the administration of the Sacrament the Layty did partake of the cup as well as the clergy. But in the Masse, the Sacrament is maimed by taking away

away the cup from the Lay people. 7. *Christ* instituted, the Sacrament in remembrance of himselfe, saying, *Do this in remembrance of me.* The Priest layes Masse in remembrance of the dead. Againe, hereby they destroy the remembrance of *Christs* death. For as a Testament doth suppose the death of the Testator, so the alteration of that Testament supposeth that the Testator is not yet dead: wherefore the Masse beeing so much altered from the institution of *Christ*, which hee bequeathed as a Testament vnto his Church, doth by consequence deny the death of *Christ*: For it beeing sufficiently proued to be another pretended Testament, differing from the first institution, doth implicetely require againe, that *Christ* should dye, recrucifying the Sonne of God; for as *Paul* sayth, *where a Testament is, there must necessarily follow the death of the Testator.* Moreouer if *Christ* be offered euery day, how is this not rather to institute a new sacrifice, then to *Do it in remembrance of his great sacrifice vpon the Crosse.*

8. *Christ* instituted the Sacrament, to be reuerently distributed vnto the people. But the Masse is reserved in the Pix, is carried about the Cities and Townes like a may-game. 9. *Christ* gaue bread and wine to his Disciples. The Priest giues God vnto the people, hee being the maker of his Maker, and they eating God with their bodyly mouthes, to *Christ* instituted the Sacrament to confirme our Faith; they lay Masse to redeeme mens soules, to cure diseases, to worke miracles.

The second impiety of the Masse. It commandeth and practiseth things directly contrary to Gods word;

word, as inuocation of Saints, and Angels, Prayer for the dead, Adoration of creatures, Purgatory, &c.

3

Thirdly, it by consequence affirmeth that *Christ* is out of the fauour of his Heauenly Father, and therefore had neede of an earthly Mediator, which is the Priest, who may offer the body of *Christ* vnto his Father, and pray that God would accept him as the sacrifice of *Abell*.

4

Fourthly, the Masse hindreth the seruice of God, for God wilbe serued in spirit and truth, with an inward and entire affection; but the Masse causeth a man to rest in the outward seruice of God, as hearing, seeing, gazing, stooping, kneeling, knocking, &c. Which things of themselves are meritorious by the worke wrought; and because the Masse alone is sufficient, therefore it makes needlesse all holy exercises as Preaching, Prayer, &c. Working presumption in wicked men, who albeit they haue spent their dayes in wickednesse, yet if they haue a Masse, or can get the Priest to say Masse for them, they doubt not but to be saued.

5

Fifthly, it blasphemeth the Deity of *Christ*, in that whereas God alone is to be worshipped with Diuine worship, they ascribe and yeelde that which is due vnto God a'one, vnto the creature, worshipping it instead of God, as the bread and the wine in the Eucharist; and doubtlesse their *Artolatrea* is nothing else but *Tololatrea*.

6

Sixtly, it derogateth from the vertue of *Christ*'s death, making it ineffectuall, and his sacrifice imperfect, ouer-turning the Crosse of *Christ*, by erecting

recting an Altar, and reiterating that perfect and all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ, which was offered once for all, whereby hee sanctified for ever, them that were perfect, having obtained eternall redemption for vs. And as the reiteration of the Leviticall sacrifices argued the imperfection of them, so the repetition of the Masse argues an insufficiency in the sacrifice of Christ.

Seuenthly, it falsifies the word of Christ. We usually obserue the last speeches of dying men, as oracles, but Christ dying vpon the Crosse, shut vp all with this speech, *It is finished*, that is, *mans salvation is finished by this my sacrifice*. And yet the Masse denies it. What is this but to make Christ a lyer?

Eightly, it denies the Article of Christ's humanity, in that it ascribes not vnto him those properties which are competent to all true bodies, and without which a reall body cannot subsist, as to be locally in one place at once, to be circumscribable, to haue true demensions, &c.

Ninthly, it denies the article of Christ's session at the right hand of God. Who enioying a true materiall body, if hee be present in the Masse, cannot sit as a man at the right hand of his Father for ever.

Tenthly, it is the ground of all diffidence and distrust in the Sacrament enemaletch our faith, while thereby wee apprehend Christ bodily absente to bee spiritually present: but the Masse depending on the intecution of the Priest cannot but beget distrust in the minds of the people.

Eleuenthly, the Masse robbes vs of the fruit of Christ's death, for the fruit of Christ's death is remission

7

8

9

10

11

and

sion of finnes, which is sealed vnto vs in the Lords Supper. But the Masse (by the consent of some of their greatest Doctors) is not auailable for the remission of finnes.

12 Twelfely, it opens the mouth of the Common Aduersary, who despises both the persons and religions of all Christians, because the Church of Rome worshippeth a breaden God.

13 The thirteenth impiety of the Masse is this, it destroyeth the eternity of *Christs* Priest-hood, who was consecrated of his father a Priest not for a time, but for euer; *after the order of Melchizedech*, which order was not temporall, as the Priest-hood of Rome, but eternall, not externall and visible after his ascension, but spirituall and inuisible, such as could neither be supplied by substitutes or successours. But by offering the sacrifice of the Masse, they make themselves *after the order of Melchizedech*, which order at the end of the world shall cease: what then shall become of *Christs* eternall Priest-hood?

14 The fourteenth impiety of the Masse. It maketh the Priest of more desert then Christ himselfe. For the sacrifice is not accepted for it selfe, but for the worthinesse of the person offering. *Cains* sacrifice was as good as *Abels*, when yet it was rejected for the wickednesse of him that offered, *Abels* being accepted for the worthinesse of the sacrificer, so the humane nature of Christ being our sacrifice, was meritorious by the vertue of the God-head, whereby it was offered vnto his Father. But if the Priests do offer the body of Christ vnto his Father, he must needs be of more desert then the sacrifice it selfe.

The fifteenth impiety of the Masse. It overthroweth the Doctrine of grace and iustification, which teacheth that in this life alone man hath time to worke his saluation, and to procure the fauour of God, and pardon for sinne. But the Masse is profitable for the dead, yea both to mitigate the paines, and totally to liberate out of Purgatory.

15

The sixteenth impiety of the Masse is. It subuerteth Gods decree of Reprobation, for it is auailable for whomsoever the Priest shall offer it, both for remission of sinne and liberation from punishment; who doubts not but then many a Reprobate for whom Masse is sayd, is deliuered from eternall damnation?

16

The seauenteenth impiety of the Masse is. It robs God of his right; for whereas it is a prerogative royall belonging to the Regall Crowne of Heauen, to institute Sacraments and Sacrifices, the Church of Rome hath vsurped that power, instituting this sacrifice which God neuer commanded them, neither came it into his minde; but they like Antiochus Ephiphanes, haue exalted their Idoll vpon the Lords Table: what audacious boldnesse was this in any man, to inuent without Gods command, a sacrifice to appease and pacifie the wrath of God? And what is it but an *Eshelothresca*, a seruice diuised of their owne carnall and corrupt wils and affections?

17

The eighteenth impiety in the Masse. It establisheth the doctrine of merit, and overthroweth the satisfaction of *Christ*; for if a man may merit by the sacrifice of the Masse, what iniustice was it in God to lay the burthen of mans wickednesse vpon *Christ*,

18

causing him to satisfie by death, when men may merit by hearing or saying Masse, by offering or receiving this sacrifice.

19

Salmeron. Ies.
tom. 9. tract. 3.
p. 247. margin.

The nineteenth impiety is. Their Iesuite *Salmeron* is permitted to write, That *the oblation of Christ in his last Supper* (which the Romanists hold to be satisfactory and Propitiatory) *received no efficacy or vertue from the sacrifice upon the crosse.* Which all Orthodox Christians cannot but iudge to bee an impious Paradox. Seeing both the Sacrament of Baptisme and of the Eucharist, haue their foundation in, and vertue, and operation, from the great and all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ offered vpon the crosse.

20

1 Col. 14. 14. 15.
16.

The twentieth impiety is in the manner of celebrating this sacrifice. In that it is performed in an vknown tongue, directly contrary to the Apostolicall iniunction of Saint *Paul*, who willet every man that prayeth to pray in that language, which the common people vnderstand, that the Church may be edified.

Secondly, in regard of the gesture of the Priest, which is so changeable, so ridiculous, so affected, more like a Player then a Sacrificer; for the Priest varieth and changeth his gesture, at least fourty or fifty times during the time of the Masse.

First, he boweth his body, then he rayseth himselfe and kisseth the Altar on the right side: he boweth againe, and looketh toward the host, hee ioyneth his hands, wipeth his fingers, listeth vp the host: then he listeth vp his eyes and boweth himselfe, and listeth vp his eyes againe: hee boweth againe and listeth vp the host aboue his forehead, vnconereth the Chalice, and holdeth it betweene his hands, keeping his thumb

and

and forefinger together: then hee boweth and listeth
vp the cup a little, then to his breast, or aboue his
head, he setteth it downe againe, wipeth his fingers:
then he spreades his armes a crosse; he boweth his bo-
dy; then rising kisseth the Altar on the right side, af-
ter this he smiteth his breast: then hee vacouereth the
Chalice againe, and maketh fise crosses with the
host, beyond the Chalice, on each side, vnder it and
before it: then he layeth his hands vpon the Altar: the
Deacon then reacheth the Priest the Paten; which he
putteth to his right eye, then to his left, and maketh
a crosse beyond his head with it, kisseth it, and layeth
it downe; then hee breaketh the host in three parts,
holding two pieces in his left hand; the other part in
his right hand ouer the Chalice, which with a crosse,
he letteth fall into it; the Priest then kisseth the *Cor-*
poras; the Deacon taketh the Pax from the Priest, gi-
ueth it to the subdeacon, and he to the Queere; then
humbling himselfe, he first taketh the body, then the
blood; so hee goeth to the right horne of the Altar;
then the Subdeacon powreth in wine, and the Priest
rinseth the cup, and washeth his hands; hee turneth
himselfe to the people, commeth againe to the Altar,
and turneth to the people the second time: then bow-
ing his body and closing his hands he prayeth to him-
selfe: he riseth againe, making the signe of the crosse,
and bowing againe, so goeth to the Altar: insomuch
that * *Roscius*-like hee seemes rather an Actor then a
priest: the Masse it selfe beeing stuffed full of ceremo-
nies borrowed from the sacrifices of both Iewes and
gentiles, as *Innocent* the third, and *Baronius* them-
selues confesse.

* In missa unus
homo vestitus
indutus scena
prophane potius
quam Cere san-
cta conuenientia
ag t, dicit mur-
murat, imo tan-
tum gesticulatur
Polan. Syntab.
tom. 2. l. 6. c. 56,
page 472.

21

The one and twentieth impiety, That the onely accidents of bread and wine can nourish the body, without their proper substance.

22

Platin. darite
Victor. terti.

The two and twentieth impiety. That the body and blood of Christ may be made poysonous, for *Bernardus de monte Politiano de Domcastro*, a Monk of the *Jacobines* order, poysoned with the Host *Henry* the seauenth Emperour of Germany; and *Victor*, Pope of Rome was poysoned with the wine he tooke in the Masse.

23

The three and twentieth impiety. That the body and blood of Christ doe subsist apart separated one from another, both in the act of consecration and afterward.

24

The foure and twentieth impiety. That Christ is now in the Eucharist, not a liuing but a dead Christ, in regard that albeit (as they affirme) the bread be changed into his body, and the wine into his blood, yet neither of these (according to their owne tenent) can be transubstantiated into his soule, which is a spirituall and an immateriall substance; how then shall his soule be vnited to his body, seeing when by these words, *This is my body*, hee changed the elements into his body and blood, yet hee makes no mention of his soule? Wherefore the body subsisting without a soule must be but inanimate, a dead corps.

25

The twenty five impiety. Christ had two bodies, one visible wherewith hee sat at Table, another inuisible, which he distributed to his Disciples vnder the formes of consecrated bread and wine.

26

The sixe and twentieth impiety. They say Christ at his last Supper gaue his naturall body to be eaten

of

of his Disciples; but by their doctrine would follow, that *Christ* gaue his mortall body, as it was before his passion vnto his Disciples; but vnto his Church hee giues now his glorified body, such as it is sitting at the right hand of God.

The seauen and twentieth impietie. That the body of *Christ* doth daily ascend into heauen, and descend from heauen, as *Iacobs* Angells, and is contained in the hands of the Priest, is crashed in his teeth, his bones being broken. 27

The eight and twentieth impiety. That the body of *Christ* being kept a long time in any vessell, will corrupt and putrifie, and wormes will bee generated of it; as *Alphonfus Magnus* the king of Aragon found by experience. 28

The twenty nine impiety. That *Christ Iesus* the Sonne of God was not incarnate for vs, suffered not, dyed not, rose not againe, ascended not into heauen for vs, but onely bread and wine did all these things in our behalfe. 29

Or which is the last impiety. The body of *Christ* was not of the seed of *Dauid*, *sed ex semine triticeo*, of the seed of wheat, was sowed in the earth, grinded in the mill, baked in the oven, and at last torne a peeces with mens teeth. 30

Thus haue I laid open vnto thee (Christian Reader) a iust suruay and tryall of the sacrifice of the Romish Masse, which (I doubt not) appeares to thee, as it is in it owne nature, a Masse of impiety, and that Mystery of iniquity foretold by *Saint Paul*; which albeit it pretend the greatest honour and worship to *Christ* of any Ecclesiasticall service; yet is there not a greater

2. Theſ. 2. 7.

ter enemy vnto our King and Saviour the Lord Ieſus; nor a more helliſh traytour vnto his crowne and dignity; wherein (if euer) *The diuell hath transformed himſelfe into an Angell of light*; couering his poiſonous and deadly hooke with the baite of religion; the moſt preualent Stratagem that euer Satan put in practice to hinder and oppugne the kingdome of *Chriſt*; yet this is the *Diana* for which *Demetrius* and his companions are ſo importunate: becauſe by this *Craft they get their gaine*. It may well bee ſailed a *Craft*, becauſe it is a Myſtery of iniquity, whereby the Church of Rome is ſwollen ſo bigge with deuouring the gold, treaſure, and inheritance of the Laity that the guttes of it are well nigh burſten.

Act. 19. 28.

This is that *Helena*, for which the aduerſaries of the truth doe ſo fiercely encounter, *which hath made the Kings of the earth drunken with the cup of her fornication*.

This they labour ſo much to vphold, which is the Pillar that vpholds them; and for it they fight (as the ancient Romanes were wont) *tanquam pro focis & aris*; while on it depends their rich offerings vpon their Altars, and the fatnes of their kitchen. Take but away this one Pillar and their houſe will fall; and the fall of it will be great; for it will ſlay all the Lords of the *Philiftims*.

Queſt.

Now if any true Orthodoxe Chriſtian, or ſound member of the Catholicke Church, demand of me whether it be lawfull for him to be preſent at Maſſe, albeit hee pretend that ſo hee keepes his heart to God?

Anſw.

I anſwere: No, for ſeeing the Maſſe is full of ſo many

many impieties, and abominable blasphemies, against the blessed person of the Sonne of God, overthrowing both the Word and Sacraments of our Lord Iesus Christ, it is therefore viterly vnlawfull for any Christian to be present at it, or to communicate in that seruice. *Argument of Ridley and Bradford.*

Secondly, we cannot be partakers of Gods religion and Antichrist seruice, whereof the Masse is a principall limbe; a man cannot bee a member of the Church of Christ, and of the Church of Rome, as it now stands. But he that frequenteth their Idolatrous assemblies makes himselfe a member thereof. And therefore cutteth himselfe off from being a member of the Church of Christ. *Argument of Bradford.*

Thirdly, to dissemble and halt in matters belonging to Gods glory, is impious and vngodly; but they who are present at Masse, both hearing the name of God blasphemed, and seeing many abominations, and yet hold their peace, do notably dissemble; Ergo, They sinne egregiously against God. *Argument of Bradford.*

Fourthly, frequenting of the Masse impugneth diuers petitions of the Lords Prayer; and to the practise of such is contrary to the dayly prayer they vse. How can we say, *Thy Kingdome come*, when nothing in the earth doth more destroy the Kingdome of Christ then the Masse? How can we pray, *Thy will be done*, when we do our owne wils, and the wils of Idolaters, flat against the will of God? How can we pray, *Hallowed be thy name*, when wee seeme to approve the Masse which is nothing but blasphemy against the whole Trinity? How can wee pray, *Deliver*

ser vs from euill, which knowing the Masse to bee euill, doe runne into it & wherefore if wee meant as we pray, we must not partake in the Masse, least wee approue of that in our practise which we condemne in our prayer. *Argument of Bradford.*

Fiftly, whatsoever giues occasion to the wicked to be more obfirmed, and to the weake to stumble and fall, is to be abhorred: But Protestants going to Masse, and by their presence giuing allowance to it, do occasion the obstinate to be more intractable, the weake Papists to be more resolute, the waivering Protestant quite to fall. *Bradfords Argument.*

Sixtly, *Daniel* refused to be filled with the Kings meates, which were polluted by Idolatry. And so *Judeth* likewise. The *Maccabees* manfully gaue their liues in defence of the Ceremonies of the Law. Ergo, we ought much more to endure and suffer all things for the maintenance of the pure word of God, and holy Sacraments. *Bishop Ridleys Argument.*

Seauenthly, God commanded his people *Israel*, by the mouth of his Prophet *Amos*, Not to seeke Bethel, nor to enter into Gilgall, where Idolatry was used. And againe, My soule hath no pleasure in those, that withdraw themselves, sayth the Lord; if any man prophane the Temple of the Lord, him will God destroy, for the Temple of God is holy, which yee are. All strange worship is counted whoredome by the Lord, and they that follow it, goe a whoring. But they that goe to Masse, enter into Bethel, and Gilgal, that is places of Idolatry, they withdraw themselves from the faith in their outward behauiour; they prophane their bodies, which are Gods Temples, being present at Idolatrous seruice, they

Dan. 1. 8.
Judith 13.

Amos 5. 5.
Heb. 10. 38.
1 Cor. 3. 17.

goe a whoring after a strange religion.

Ergo; Protestants, going to Masse, disobey Gods command, procure his displeasure, will cause God to destroy them, and diuorce themselves from God and his Church. *Philpots Argument.*

Eightly, The Apostle directly forbids all participation with such as are Idolaters, in the eating of meat sacrificed to Idolls, shewing, that thereby the weak brethren are offended, and the partakers make themselves Communicants at the Table of Diuells: now a man cannot be partaker at the Lords Table, and the table of Diuells. But, the Masse is an Idolatrous service, a superstitious worship, and the Altar thereof is the Table of Diuells, howsoeuer it is to be hallowed with the inuocation of God the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost; Angels, Apostles, Martyres, Confessors, Saints, and painted ouer with the lustre of religion, whereas it is indeed, nothing but a painted *Iezabel*, a deceitfull Strumpet with a false complexion.

1 Cor. 8. 9, 10,
11, 12.
1 Cor. 10. 14,
15, 16, 20, 21.

Ninthly, God is the Creator both of soule and body, therefore he is to be worshipped both in soule and body; *Know ye not that your body is the Temple of the holy Ghost, therefore glorifie God in your body and spirit which are Gods*: whereas God hath giuen both, so hee requires the seruice of both. And *Paul* will not giue a tolleration to any man to dishonour God by his body: *I beseech you brethren by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable vnto God.*

1 Cor. 6. 20,
21.

Rom. 12. 1.

God will not be content with reseruing the soule

Ff

to him, when men bestow the worship of their bodies vpon Idols. The soule and body make one man, and God will be worshipped in the whole entire man; he will not diuide stakes with the Masse; for, as he requieth the whole heart, which is the soule; so hee also commandeth the whole strength, which is the body. Againe, the soule cannot be in heauen, if the body be in hell; neither can he bow the knee of his soule to God, that bowes the knee of his body to the Diuell.

1 Sam. 5. 4.

The Arke and *Dagon* cannot rest vnder one roose: one man cannot be the temple of God and of Idols.

Mat. 4. 10.

Tenthly, Christ would not fall downe and worship the Tempter, albeit he might haue reserved his heart to God. And in *Elisha* his time, God accounted none for his seruants, but such as had not bowed

1 King. 19. 18.

the knee vnto *Baal*: so God accounts none for his seruants that giue outward worship to the Idoll of the Masse, by bowing vnto it in token of adoration, by kissing the Pax, by creeping to the Crosse, by being sprinkled with holy water. Will a husband, finding his wife committing Adultery with another, admit this as a lawfull and reasonable excuse, that her heart was with her husband? No more will Christ allow our bodily presence at the Masse, although our hearts be not consenting to it. *Bransford's Answer.*

And indeede, this is the difference betweene the Church of God, and the Synagogue of *Satan*, that the one is a chaste wife and Spouse of Christ, & keeps her to her husband alone, and doth not permit others to the vse of her faith; the other plaies the harlot with many lovers, and keepes not her faith nor worship to God alone.

Eleuenthy,

Eleuently, if we must auoide an Hereticke; then much more an Idolater: But an Hereticke is to bee auoided; *A man that is an Hereticke, after the first and second admonition, reiect*; as S. Iohn fled from *Cerintus*, and *Polycarpe* from *Marcion*.

TIT. 3. 10. 112
Iren. de heresib.
l. 3. c. 3.

Ergo, An Idolater is to be auoided, and by consequence, the participation in Idolatrous seruice. For, if S. Iohn would not abide vnder the rooffe, nor haue any ciuill society with *Cerintus* an Hereticke, how can a Christian ioyne in diuine worship with such as are Idolaters?

Euseb. Hist. Ec-
cles. lib. 3. c. 25.
c. 1. 4. c. 5.

Lastly, the Apostle charges vs to auoide all appearance of euill. 1 *Thes.* 5. 22. But how doe Christians auoid the appearance of euill, when they associate themselves with Idolaters, partaking with them in their abomination, and consenting to their dishonouring of God by superstitions, which in the Masse is done in a high degree: whereby it appeares euidently that it is altogether vnlawfull for an Orthodoxe Christian, a true protestant, a sound member of the Church of Christ, to be present at the Idolatrous sacrifice of the Masse, albeit with a pretence of keeping his heart to God.

Thus, hauing laid downe sound and solide reasons for our *non conformity* vnto that Idolatrous worship, neither in body nor soule. I shall thinke it expedient to take away all excuses of such as desire to haule betweene God and *Baal*; approouing the reformed religion of the Church of England, yet, shall either for feare, fauour, or hope of gaine, at any time be brought to ioyne with the Romanists in hearing or seeing of Masse.

Plea 1.

First they plead; That albeit there be some faults in the Masse, which may be mended; yet, if they doe not consent thereunto, what need they trouble themselves; for, *S. Augustine* saith; *Communion in the Sacraments defileth not a man, but consent of deeds.*

Answer.

If there were but some small faults, or indifferent matters, or tollerable abuses in the Masse, rather shewing imperfection, then tending to open impiety, they might, for the common Peace sake, be somewhat borne with. But now, seeing it is stuffed full of blasphemies, and spotted with foule Idolatry, manifestly oppugning Christs sacred Gospel, and most Diuine institution of the Lords Supper; no man can therefore with good conscience giue consent thereunto. And *Augustines* meaning is (as appears by the precedent and subsequent words) that the badnesse of the Minister, or wickednes of the Receiuers pollute not the Sacraments, nor such as receiue with faith and due preparation; but, with either wicked Minister, or Receiuers, to commit vngodly actions is that which defiles a man. Hee saith not, that men ought to refrain from Idolatrous worship, for feare of pollution. *Bishop Ridelies answer.*

Plea 2.

Secondly, they plead the examples of the Prophets of Christ, of the Apostles; for, *Elijah* stood by when *Baal's* Priests offered Sacrifice: And a Prophet came vnto the Altar, where *Ieroboam* was offering incense vnto the golden Calfe, which he had erected at *Bethel*. Christ himselfe refused not the Temple, albeit the Priests were growne very prophane, corrupt, and superstitious. And *Paul* also came into the Gentiles Temple, where hee saw an Altar dedica-

1 King. 18;

2 King. 13. 1.

ted to the *Unknowne God*.

Act. 17. 23.

By these examples they iudge themselues priuiledged to goe to Masse.

I answer; These examples doe not patronize such as partake in the Idolatrous Seruice of the Masse. For, first *Eliab*, when he stood by the Priests of *Baal*, it was not to partake with them, but to conuince them of their Idolatry, and to discouer vnto the people who was the true God. The Prophet that came to the Altar of *Bethel*, was sent of God to propheticie against it: neither did either of these Prophets communicate with these Idolaters, or vouchsafed the least reuerence vnto their Idols, or superstitious seruice. So Christ and the Apostles frequented the Temple, and ioyned with the Iewes in those lawful ceremonies which God had commanded them by the mouth of *Moses*; but for their hypocrisie they did openly reprove it, not imitating them in their superstitious traditions. And for *Paul*, it appeares not that he entred into the Idolls Temple, or went on purpose to behold their worship, but saw it accidentally, for so he saies; *As I passed by and beheld your deuotions, I saw an Altar with this inscription; To the unknowne God*. And it is to be obserued, that *Paul* gaue no honour to their Idolatry, but tooke hereby a iust occasion to reueale vnto them the true God, and to preach vnto them, *Iesus Christ*. So, that these examples, rather make against such as goe to Masse, professing the contrary religion, seeing that Christ Iesus, his Apostles, and Prophets, rather did by their presence, condemne such Idolatry and superstition, then any way seeme to giue any approbation of it. But such dissembling

Answer.

Protestants as secretly resort to heare Masse, doe by their presence yeeld allowance and approbation of that Idolatrous seruice.

Plea 3.

Thirdly, they plead, that except they goe to Masse, they loose their lands, liuings, and wealth, they are driuen to fly their Countrey, to forsake both fauour and lociety of their parents, kindred, friends, or acquaintance, and thereby themselves, their wiues and children are brought to beggery.

I answer in the words of our Sauour; *Hee that loveth father, or mother, or friends, houses, lands, riches, wife, or children more then Christ, is not worthy of him.* And whosoever shall for feare of the losse of any of these, revolt away from God and his truth, is not worthy of the name of a Christian, seeing hee appeares, rather to bee a louer of himselfe then of Christ, preferring his owne temporall profit, before spirituall gaine; the fauour of men, before the loue of God; the satisfiying of friends, before the honour of his Sauour; the enioying of an earthly habitation, before the purchasing of an earthly kingdome. Wherefore it is better to loose these, and win Christ; then to attaine these by apostacie and Idolatry, and loose Christ: Yea, *what would it bene fit thee to gaine the whole world, by going to Masse, and so loose thine owne soule?* But albeit, in the daies of persecution, the Martyres of Christ haue beene so violently pursued with cruelty, as that they were constrained to sacrifice themselves to God in the fire, because they would not forsake Christ Iesus, and ioyne with the Romish Idolaters in their blasphemous Masse; witnesse *Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Bradford, Phil-*
pot,

pot, Bilney, with many more: yet (thanks be to God) in these our daies the Gospell flourisheth, the Sacraments are purely administred, according to Christs institution; and there is freedom by the lawes of the Realme, giuen to all sound Protestants, to serue God, according to the doctrine now established in the Church of England. And if it bee not lawfull for a man to go to Masse by compulsion, but that he ought rather to suffer the spoyling of his goods, the losse of friends, or to lay downe his life for Christ and his truth, then to participate with them in their blasphemous seruice, and impious Sacrifice. Then cursed shall that man be, that being a Protestant, a professor of the true Catholike faith (howsoeuer our Aduersaries of Rome challenge the title) shall voluntarily, and without compulsion, either for flattery, fashion, present gaine, or future hopes, or the fauour of great Personages be drawne to deny his Christ, and to cleaue vnto Antichrist, forsaking the Church of God, and becomming one of the Synagogue of Satan, forgoing *Sion*, for *Babylon*; *Jerusalem*, for *Bethel* and *Samaritan*: refusing the waters of *Siloam*, which run softly, and cleauing vnto *Resin*, and *Remelians Sonne*: rejecting the Communion of Saints, in the participation of the Word and Sacraments, taught and administred in the Protestant Church, now established in England, and associating himselfe vnto the Sons of *Belial*, participating with them in their abominable sacrifice of the Masse. He that shall thus doe, is much more unworthy of Christ, then such as shall be constrained, or by feare forced to consent vnto their Idolatry; and doubtlesse shall finde such horror in his

Isa. 8. 6.

his conscience, and feele such a hell in his soule, as that if God make him not a spectacle of shame and misery in this world, yet he shall surely doe it before men and Angells in the world to come.

Plea 4.

Fourthly, they plead the example of *Daniel*, who, say they, was present, and worshipped the golden Image, which appeares by this, that hee was not cast into the Furnace, with the three Children his Companions.

Answer.

I answer, that either *Daniel* was not present, which is most probable, or else he was not accused vnto the King: or if hee were accused, it may be the King would not heare his accusation, or put him to death for the great fauour and affection which he bare vnto him for the great seruice he did in his kingdome. And doubtlesse *Daniel*, that would rather be a prey vnto the Lyons, then not pray vnto his God; had rather haue tryed the heat of the fiery Furnace, then haue vouchsafed so much countenance to Idolatry, as to worship the golden Image.

Plea 5.

2 King. 10. 18.

Fifthly, they plead the example of *Iehu*, who openly professed the religion of *Baal*, yet hee dissembled and meant nothing lesse, and the Lord commends him for his diligent Execution of that which was right in his eyes. *Vers. 30.*

Answer.

Our answer is, *Iehu* is commended, not for his dissembling, but for his diligence in destroying *Ahab* house, with the Priests, and religion of *Baal*, and all that belonged thereunto; for, in other matters belonging to the seruice of God, he departed not from the sinnes of *Ieroboam*, the Sonne of *Nebat*, that made *Israel* to sinne: wherefore this can be no excuse

cuse for going to Masse, seeing God neuer approued
of dissimulation.

Sixtly, they plead the command of the Magistrate,
thus; Wee are commanded to obey our Magistrates
though they be wicked, and therefore, if they enioyn
vs to goe to Masse, we see not how we can doe other-
wise for feare of contempt and disobedience.

Plea 6.

We are bound indeed to obey wicked gouernours,
but so long onely as they command nothing contra-
ry to Gods word, their wickednesse cannot release vs,
or giue a dispensation for disobedience, but if they
command any thing contrary to Gods word;
especially to partake in the Masse, a superstitious ser-
uice, so directly blaspheming Christ and his seruice,
so plainly opposing the doctrine of the Gospell, and
so fundamentally euerting the institution of the
Lords Supper: in this case obedience is a sinne; for,
what say the Apostles of Iesus? their answer is; *where-
ther it be right in the sight of God, to hearken vnto you
more then vnto God, iudge yee.* And our Sauiour tea-
cheth vs, to *Giue vnto Caesar that which is Caesars, and
vnto God that which is Gods.* As wee performe our
lawfull duties to men, so must we not for their sakes,
neglect our duties to God, or doe any thing whereby
he is dishonoured.

Answer.

As appeares in
the 12. of
Matth. ch. 17.
And in the
12. of
Matth. ch. 17.
Book 1. ch. 12.

Seuenthly and lastly, they plead the example of Na-
man the Sytian, who being conuerted to the true wor-
ship of the God of Israel, desired to bee dispenced
with when he should goe with the King his Master
into the house of Rimmon an Idoll, and bow himselfe
there, and that herein, God would be mercifull vnto
him;

Plea 7.

2 King. 18. 19.

Answer.

Zanch. in Eph 5
Perkins on the
2 Commande-
ment.

As appeares
Zanc. l. de re-
demptione.
And Perk. Case
of Conscience,
Book. 2. ch. 12.

him; vnto whom the Prophet *Elisha* answered; *Goe in peace*; as liking of his motion, and yeelding to it. Wee answer; the opinions of Diuines, touching this thing are diuers; some thinke he spake onely of ciuill and politike presence, that his Master the King might leane vpon him before his *Idoll*; and not of Religious; for he makes open protestation, that hee would neuer worship other God then the God of *Israel*; to the which the Prophet condescendeth. But howloeuver, the gesture it selfe is indifferent, to stand when the King stands, or bow when the King boweth; yet this gesture being clothed with such circumstan- ces, seemes not to be approoued. That he should do this.

First, in a Temple.

Secondly, before an *Idoll*.

Thirdly, in the time of publike seruice.

Fourthly, by one professing the true God.

This seemes not so probable. And both these fa- mous Diuines departed from this answer, cleauing vnto that which was more sound in their latter workes.

Others thinke, he speaketh of the time past; as if he should say; *Herein, that I haue bowed in the house of Rimmon, &c. The Lord be mercifull vnto me: vsing the future, for the time past.*

Others (and that more truly) expound the words of *Naaman* thus; That *Naaman* professed it a sinne to goe in to bow with his Master in the house of *Rimmon*, and therefore prayeth twice for mercy for it, pro- fessing, he will neuer worship any but the true God:

neither

neither doth he onely pray for sinne past, but in the
 sence of his owne weakenesse desireth mercy that
 hee may not bee drawne from his purpose, and
 withall stirreth vp the Prophet to pray for him
 that God would giue him grace and strength,
 and for pardon if at any time hee should a-
 gainst his purpose bee drawne into his former
 sinne: and in this sence the Prophet bids him
 goe in peace: as if hee should say, *I will pray*
that God would keepe thee in thy goodly resolution, and
for mercy and pardon if thou shouldst be drawne aside;
and so farewell.

The words of the Prophet Elisha, *Goe in peace*: are
 also diuersly expounded. Some thinke the Prophets
 words insinuate no grant made vnto his petition, but
 rather a prohibition, not to trouble himselfe about
 those matters; as if he should haue sayd, *Content thy*
selfe, require no such thing, it would trouble thy consci-
ence, but goe in peace, keepe a good conscience, and labour
for the peace thereof; (& so as Polan obserues) the words
 of the Prophet are, *Tantum dimittis ab eum, non*
concedentis postulationem; onely a valediction, and not a
 ny concession or granting of his request.

Againe, it appeares not by the words of the Pro-
 phet that he gaue any tolleration or dispensation vn-
 to *Naaman*: for *Naaman* makes in one verse two pe-
 titions; one for permission to goe into *Rimmons*
 Temple; the other for two mules load of earth to car-
 ry home with him to offer sacrifice vpon, vnto the
 Lord.

Now the Prophet makes the same answer vnto both,
 and

Willet. Synop.

Willet. Synop.
 Willet. Synop.
 Willet. Synop.
 Willet. Synop.

Polan. Syntag.
 tom. 2. l. 9. c. 30.

Polan. Syntag.
 tom. 2. l. 9. c. 30.

Polan. Syntag.
 tom. 2. l. 9. c. 30.

and therefore doth either condescend to both or deny both: but grant them both he did not, for the one was cleane contrary to the law, to giue *Naaman* leave to sacrifice in Syria who was not a Priest, whose office it was alone to offer sacrifice; and moreover Ierusalem was the onely place appointed for that action. This request therefore the Propheticall by no meanes be thought to haue granted.

Ergo, nor the other. And vnto this sence I doe adhere, for that the Prophet neither could nor durst giue any liberty to *Naaman* to be present at the Idolatrous worship of the Syrian *Rimmon*.

I am not ignorant of the opinion of some that the Prophet answers *dispensando*, by the way of dispensation, though not generally, yet in that case, onely to goe into the Idols Temple, and to bee present at their Idolatry. But *Lyranius* will haue it *declarando*, by declaring it to be lawfull for *Naaman* to bee present in the Temple of *Rimmon* at Idolatrous service and sacrifice, so it were onely for ciuill respect vnto the king his Master; and of this opinion seemes *Tertullian* to be; who allowes a man to bee present by reason of some ciuill office, so hee yeeld not to the least shew of Idolatry; but I should rather commend the practise of the Protestant Princes at *Augusta*, who brought *Charles* the first their Emperour, along as he was going to the Masse, but left him at the Church doore; as also of *Valentinian* who brought *Iulian* to the Temple of his Idols, and when the doore-keeper sprinkled his gowne with the Idols water, as the Pagans vsed, *Valentinian* forthwith gaue him a blow on the eare.

Conclusion

As Paulus Burgensis.
Nichbl. Lyra in locum.

Tert. de Idolat.

Hist. Tripart.
46. c. 35.

Conclusion.

Thus having sufficiently refelled their strongest arguments, and given answer to their chieftest pleas, the conclusion shall bee this. Seeing the Romish Masse hath quite overthrowne, and thrust the Supper of the Lord out of the Church; (the holy Supper being an assembly, a body of the faithfull, vnited and knit together in one spirit; strengthening our faith, enflaming our charity, kindling our zeale; wherein is celebrated the memory of the death and passion of our Lord by a plaine and open rehearfall of the cause, manner, and benefits of the same; whereby the faithfull are taught to acknowledge and call to mind the greatnesse of their sinnes, and to admire and magnifie the great and vnspeakeable mercies of God; whereby they are stirred vp to renounce and forsake themselves, to giue themselves wholly vnto God, to dye vnto their lusts, and concupiscences, and to liue vnto Christ, who having once deliuered himselfe to the death of the crosse for to giue them life, did yet further vouchsafe to giue himselfe to them in this sacrament, as spirituall meate and drinke to feede their soules vnto eternall life; and herein all the faithfull doe communicate together in the bread and in the cup; in the body and in the blood of our Lord, being taught thereby that they are diuers members of one mysticall hody, whereof Christ is the head; being quickned, mooued, and gouerned by one Spirit, euen the Spirit of Christ, liuing one life, and having their hearts vnited one to another by loue.

Herein wee are seriously admonished of our bond and obligation to God the Father for sending his Son, and God the Sonne fulfilling the will of his Father; the remembrance of whose death wee shew forth till he come; who (as verily as the Minister giueth vs the bread and wine to be receiued with our hands, which being earen and drunken, are conuerted into our substances and become nourishments of our bodies) giueth vs his body and blood to be receiued with faith, that we may eate and drinke them spiritually, and that they may be turned into the life and substance of our soules, making vs one with Christ, and Christ one with vs.

This was the holy Supper of the faithfull in the ancient Church, and this is ours; with the rest of the reformed Churches. But in the Masse there are no footsteps of the holy Supper; but all things are so changed, as if the Lords Supper were abolished, and the Masse were come in the stead therof; for in the Masse there is a Priest in a strange garment, his face fixt vpon an Altar, with a Clarke standing behind him, muttering in a strange language, interlarded with signes, lifting vp a wafer in an affected and ceremoniall superstitious sort; causing it to be worshipped; dipping it in the wine, eating it alone, perswading the people, that by thus much as hath beene done, beeing at their request, and bought with some piece of money, he hath sacrificed Christ for them. What shewing foorth of *the Lords death is there till he come?* Nay is there not an abolishing of the perfection, value and efficacy of Christs death and sacrifice? Is their not sacriledge in robbing the lay-people of the cup? Is not the Masse
full

ful of abominable blasphemies and grosse impieties? Are not the deaths and sufferings of Saints and Martyrs rather reckoned vp then the death of Christ represented? Is there not rather a breach of charity then any Symbole of loue, when the Priest eates all himselfe, the common people being excluded from it? where is there any communion betweene the members, (or signification of our engraving into Christ?) The scriptures neither authorising, nor the Primitiue and Apostolicall Church practising, nor the Fathers in the first 600. yeares acknowledging any such Propitiatory sacrifice, as the Church of Rome both offereth and adoreth; but in turbulent ages it grew from a Sacrament to a sacrifice; from a Sacrifice of prayse to a Propitiatory sacrifice by way of representation; from thence in times of ignorance, carelesnesse, and Politicall contentions to a reall and proper Propitiatory Sacrifice.

And seeing God our heavenly Father hath spread a table for vs in this wilderness, while others starue for foode, let every true Christian say with the Prodigall sonne, *I will arise and goe to my Father*; Let vs all remember that exuberant and superabundant refreshing, which we shall receiue from the table of God our Father, where Christ himselfe is the refection and sustenance of our soules, that our soules being nourished by faith in our Mediatour and sacrifice, Christ the Lord, both soule and body may bee saued by him in the day of iudgement,

Luk. 15. 18.

Oh that God would open the blind eyes of such as are ensnared with the allurements of the Romish Church, and deceiued with the false complexion of that

that painted *Iesabell*, beeing poysoned with the cup of her fornications; that so (if they belong vnto the election of grace) they may escape out of Babylon, and be saued.

And for vs that haue beene borne of the Church, and brought vp in her bosome, vnto whom God hath reuealed the purity of his word, and exhibited his holy Sacraments without maim or alteration; let vs neuer disclaime our Spirituall mother, making our selues bastards by becomming the children of a Scarlet coloured Whore; let vs neuer become Apostates from the truth, staining our soules, and wounding our consciences by Idolatry.

If we be Iewes, that is, the Israel of God; let not vs pollute our selues with Romish Samaritans; Let vs not communicate with them in their impious Mystery or Mysticall impiety, of their Massing Sacrifice; least wee runne vpon our owne ruine and destruction.

But let vs abhorre it, as beeing Antichristian; let vs renounce it as most blasphemous against God, and against his Christ.

Let neither prosperity, nor aduersitie, hope of profit, or feare of losse draw vs to pertake in that Idolatrous seruice, least while we seeke the world we loose our soules; and while wee feare the face of man, we bereaue our selues of the fauour of God.

Let our aduersaries perseuere in their superstition, they are blind leaders of the blind; but let euery Christian *Ioshua*, say couragiously, *I and mine will feare, will serue, will worship* the Lord of heauen and earth, and not make to my selfe *a bredden god, or adore the

* As *Auerroes* vpbraided the Christians.

the creature in stead of the Creator.

Let vs not for feare of the Popes *Anathema's* ex-communicate our selues from the society of Gods Saints: but rather to say with vndaunted resolution in the words of *Paul. we are ready not onely to be bound, but dye at Rome for the name of the Lord. Iesus.* And albeit these are the dayes wherein the enemies of the Gospell thinke to preuaile, yet fortifie your selues with courage in your profession, start not a side like a broken Bow; forsake not Christ to take part with his Aduersaries, but stand for your Sauour, as hee hath stood for you, fight for your Sauour, as hee hath fought for you, dye for your Sauour, as he hath dyed for you, that you may receiue the reward of immortality with the rest of the holy Saints and Martyrs in the kingdome of heauen for the infinite merit of our eternall Priest, and Al-sufficient Sacrifice Iesus Christ the righteous. To whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost, three distinct persons, but one glorious and euerliuing God be ascribed Honour, Maiestie, Power and Dominion for euer.

Amen.

Faults escaped.

P Ag. 12. l. 28, *band*, r. *bands*. p. 20. l. 24. for place, r. places. p. 21.
l. 22. for deered, r. decreed. p. 23. l. 22. for neere, r. were, p. 24.
l. 18. for inauimate, r. inanimate, p. 25. l. 6. for *Ilastica*, r. *Hilastica*,
which fault escaped in diuers other places, p. 25. l. 26. for his
r. this. p. 28. l. 28. for *phusian*, r. *thusian*, p. 28. l. 32. for open, reade
oxen, p. 30. l. 12. for finne, r. finne, p. 42. l. 3. for almes, reade all
men, p. 84. l. 32. for *Bitratum*, r. *Bitantum*, p. 85. l. 18. for com-
mendation, r. commemoration, p. 88. l. 18. for *and*, r. *a. p.* 106. l.
29. for *suffered*, r. *offered*, p. 107. l. 31. for *hexemegae*, r. *exanekg*,
p. 109. for *best*, r. *beast*, p. 110. for *ben*, r. *en*. ibid. 111. for He-
brewes, r. Hebrew, ibid. l. 13. for *partioiple*, r. *particle*, p. 111. l. 20.
for *an*, r. *no*, p. 195. l. 30. for *men*, r. *men*, p. 198. l. 16. for *their*, read
three, p. 206. l. 29, for *Tololatrcia*, r. *Idolatrcia*.

FINIS
